IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM 1976
NO. 76-200

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
(Austin Independent School District), et al,
Petitioner

V.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al,
Respondents
MEXICAN-AMERICAN LEGAL DEFENSE &
EDUCATION FUND, et al,
Intervenors-Respondents
DEDRA ESTELL OVERTON, NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF
COLORED PEOPLE, et al,
Intervenors-Respondents

APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

William H. Bingham
Shannon H. Ratliff
David L. Orr

McGINNIS, LOCHRIDGE &
KILGORE
5th Floor, Texas State Bank Building
900 Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701

UNITED STATES of America,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

Dedra Estell Overton et al.,
Intervenors-Appellants,

v.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY et al.,
(Austin Independent School District),
Defendants-Appellees.

No. 73-3301.

United States Court of Appeals,
Fifth Circuit

May 13, 1976

WISDOM, Circuit Judge:

The United States and various black and Mexican-American intervenors have challenged the student assignment policies of the Austin Independent School District (AISD). This is the second time this case has come before us. In 1972, our en banc Court remanded the case to the district court with directions to eliminate all discriminatory segregation against black and Mexican-American students and to establish a unitary school system in Austin. *United States v. Texas Education Agency*, 5 Cir., 467 F.2d 848 (*Austin I*). At the time of that decision, the AISD was 65 percent Anglo, 20 percent Mexican-American, and 15 percent black. Eighty-three percent of the black students and 58 percent of the Mexican-

Americans attended schools that contained over three-fifths minority[1] students. The district court, on remand from our en banc decision, adopted the desegregation plan submitted by the AISD. This plan has had two years of operation to prove itself. The school system is now 62 percent Anglo, 23 percent Mexican-American, and 15 percent black. Forty-two percent of the black Austin students and 45 percent of the Mexican-Americans still attend schools that are over three-fifths minority. Progress has been made. But the AISD is far from a unitary system.

This Austin case differs from the one we considered in 1972 in two respects. First, we must weigh the effect of the Supreme Court decision in *Keyes*[2] on the burdens of the plaintiffs and defendants. Second, we must measure the constitutional sufficiency of the new desegregation plans the AISD and the intervenors have submitted.

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This school desegregation case was filed in August 1970 by the United States against the Texas Education Agency and seven school districts, including the AISD. The complaint alleged that (1) historically, the defendants had operated a dual system based on race, and continued to do so, and (2) the defendants discriminatorily assigned Mexican-Americans to schools identifiable as Mexican-American schools or as schools intended for blacks and

---

[1]The term "minority" is used to refer collectively to Mexican-American and black students.

[2]*Keyes v. School District No. 1,* Denver, Colorado, 1973, 413 U.S. 189, 93 S.Ct. 2686, 37 L.Ed.2d 548.

Mexican-Americans. Certain blacks and Mexican-Americans intervened on their own behalf and as representatives of those similarly situated.

After the parties and the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were unable to agree on a desegregation plan, the district court consolidated a hearing that took place June 14 to June 21, 1971. The court held that there had been no *de jure* discrimination against Mexican-Americans and afforded them no relief. It then held that the "vestiges of a dual system continue to exist with respect to blacks" and adopted, with minor modifications, the AISD plan for establishing a unitary school system in Austin. The high schools and junior high schools were to be desegregated primarily by busing about 2200 blacks to previously predominantly white schools. The elementary schools were "clustered" into groups of six schools each. One week per month the students of each cluster were to meet together to engage in certain planned activities. The district court found "that elementary students would be in a desegregated environment as much as twenty-five (25) percent of the school year".

This Court, sitting en banc, reversed and remanded the case to the district court with directions to eliminate the unconstitutional segregation of Mexican-American and black students "at once". 467 F.2d at 883. We held that the AISD had caused and perpetuated the segregation of blacks within the school system and that it had not dismantled this dual system. The Court further held that the educational status of Mexican-American students was inferior to that of their Anglo counterparts and that Mexican-Americans in Austin were a separate ethnic minority within the ambit of the Equal Protection Clause. Because

school authorities, by their actions, contributed to the segregation of Mexican-Americans in the Austin schools, we held that these students were denied the equal protection of the laws.

The en banc Court divided only on the issue of remedy. A majority of the Court directed the district court to eliminate the dual school system and itemized a hierarchy of desegregation tools that the court should consider using. Six judges dissented: "The majority opinion . . . [is] an example of how a reviewing court can pass the buck, give the school board a delay, and confuse the district court on remand." 467 F.2d at 888. This evaluation has to some extent been borne out by later events. The district judge admitted to the attorneys in this case that he was baffled by the majority opinion on remedy and asked for help in interpreting it. The response of the attorneys (of both the intervening appellants and the AISD) was to move for clarification of this Court's mandate. The motion was denied over the dissent of five judges. *United States v. Texas Education Agency*, 5 Cir. 1973, 470 F.2d 1001 (en banc).

On August 3, 1972, the day after our en banc decision was issued, the district court ordered the parties to hold a pre-trial conference within five days to discuss the possibility of joining in the submission of a single desegregation plan to that court. If no agreement could be reached, the AISD, the United States, and the intervenors were ordered to the district court on that day that it was "unable to submit a desegregation plan at this time" and recommended to the court "that local officials be given the opportunity to formulate and submit a plan to the Court before the Court or other parties consider alternatives or modifications to such a plan". On the same

day, the intervenors and the AISD filed desegregation plans. The Government has yet to file any plan.

The AISD's plan would establish six sixth grade centers that would draw all sixth-graders in the school district. The intervenors' plan would require the busing of all kindergarten (K)-to-fourth-grade students at the predominantly minority schools in East Austin to new grade K-4 schools in West Austin, and the busing of all fifth-to-eighth-grade students at predominantly Anglo schools in West Austin to new grade 5—8 schools in East Austin. The plan would also close the one predominantly minority high school remaining in Austin (Johnston) and bus its students to the remaining high schools. The black intervenors added an objection to the 1971 closing of the black high school (Anderson) and black junior high school (Kealing) in Austin, and requested that the schools be reopened and used in any desegregation plan adopted by the court. The district judge conducted the trial for twelve days in May, 1973. He issued a "Memorandum Opinion and Order" on August 1, 1973.

The district court first held that, because the AISD had, in the past, intentionally segregated black students, it must now dismantle its dual system based on race. Second, the court held that its finding of past intentional segregation of blacks constituted a prima facie case of intentional segregation of Mexican-Americans. It concluded, however, that the AISD had successfully rebutted this prima facie case by demonstrating that its racial policies were unrelated to its treatment of Mexican-Americans and that there was an absence of segregative intent toward Mexican-Americans. The court, relying on *Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado,* 1973, 413

U.S. 189, 93 S.Ct. 2686, 37 L.Ed.2d 548, held that it would therefore be improper to order "all-out desegregation" of Mexican-Americans. The court then rejected the black intervenors' challenge of the closing of Anderson and Kealing schools and adopted, with minor modifications, the AISD's plan for establishing an integrated school system. Because Mexican-American students are an identifiable minority entitled to equal protection of the laws, the court further held that they were entitled to equal educational opportunties, including the setting up of special educational programs, such as bilingual and bicultural education.

The United States and the plaintiff-intervenors have appealed from this Memorandum Opinion and Order of the district court.

II. SEGREGATION OF MEXICAN-AMERICANS

A. The *Keyes* Case

[1-3] The Supreme Court held in *Brown v. Board of Education,* 1954, 347 U.S. 483, 495, 74 S.Ct. 686, 692, 98 L.Ed. 873, 881, that educational facilities segregated on the basis of race are inherently unequal. In *Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado,* 1973, 413 U.S. 189, 195-98, 93 S.Ct. 2686, 2690-2692, 37 L.Ed.2d 548, 555-557, the Court extended this principle to the segregation of Mexican-Americans in the Denver school system. The unequal educational status of these minorities does not constitute a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment unless it results from "state action". The term of art that has long described the state action requirement in the school desegregation context is "*de jure* segregation", which the Supreme Court has defined as "a current condition of segregation resulting from intentional state action directed specifically to the [segregated] schools". *Keyes,* 413 U.S. at 205-06, 93 S.Ct. at 2697, 37 L.Ed.2d at 561. *See generally Cisneros v. Corpus Christi Independent School District,* 5 Cir. 1972, 467 F.2d 142, 148 (en banc), *cert. denied,* 1973, 413 U.S. 920, 93 S.Ct. 3053, 37 L.Ed.2d 1041. To establish a prima facie case of unlawful school segregation, the plaintiffs must therefore prove (1) that there is segregation in public schools, (2) that state officials have, with segregative intent, taken or refrained from taking certain actions, and (3) that the present segregated system is a result of that action or inaction.[3]

[3] The eight concurring judges in *Austin I* held:

> The power of the district court will depend first upon a finding of the proscribed discrimination in the school system. . . . In determining the fact of discrimination *vel non* . . . , the district court must identify the school or schools which are segregated as a result of such discrimination . . . The importance of such a determination will be seen in some populous school districts embracing large geographical areas. There may be segregated schools which are the result of unconstitutional statutes or of official action. There may be other one race schools which are the product of neutral, non-discriminatory forces.

467 F.2d at 884. To the extent that this holding requires a court to identify the intentional state action that segregated a school as a prerequisite to including that school in a desegregation plan, the holding was unambiguously supervened by *Keyes*. The Supreme Court there stated:

> We have never suggested that plaintiffs in school desegregation cases must bear the burden of proving the elements of *de jure* segregation as to each and every school or each and every student within the school system. . . . [W]here plaintiffs prove that the school authorities have carried out a systematic program of segregation affecting a substantial portion of the students, schools, teachers, and facilities within the school system, it is on-

The remainder of the *Keyes* opinion considers whether proof of *de jure* segregation in a portion of the Denver school district is sufficient to establish a system-wide constitutional violation. This section of *Keyes* is irrelevant to our disposition of the case before us because we hold below that the plaintiffs have proved that intentional segregation exists throughout the Austin school district.

B. The *Cisneros-Austin I* Test

We found in *Austin I* that Mexican-American students in Austin had received an education inferior to that of their Anglo counterparts and that this was the result of ethnic segregation. 467 F.2d at 862–63 & n.21. This would constitute an equal protection violation, we held, only if the "school authorities, by their actions, [had] contribute[d] to segregation in education, whether by causing additional segregation or maintaining existing segregation . . . ." 467 F.2d at 863–64. Our ultimate decision against the AISD was based in part on our finding that "[t]he natural and foreseeable consequence of [its] actions was segregation of Mexican-Americans". 467 F.2d at 863. We held, however, that, to establish an equal protection violation, it is not necessary to prove discriminatory intent when there is discriminatory effect. 467 F.2d at 864–65 n.25.

Although, in *Cisneros,* we discarded "the anodyne dichotomy of classical de facto and de jure segregation", the rationale of that decision was very similar to that of

---

ly common sense to conclude that there exists a predicate for a finding of the existence of a dual school system.

413 U.S. at 200, 201, 93 S.Ct. at 2694, 37 L.Ed.2d at 558.

Austin I. The Court held that, in order to sustain a constitutional violation,

> [we] need only find a real and significant relationship, in terms of cause and effect, between state action and the denial of educational opportunity occasioned by the racial and ethnic separation of public school students.

Id. As in *Austin I,* we held that "[d]iscriminatory motive and purpose . . are not necessary ingredients of constitutional violations in the field of public education". 467 F.2d at 149. And, in language reminiscent of the *Austin I* "foreseeable consequences" approach, the Court found the requisite state action in *Cisneros* in the Board's imposition of "a neighborhood school plan, *ab initio,* upon a clear and established pattern of residential segregation in the face of an obvious and inevitable result". *Id.*

Thus, *Austin I* and *Cisneros* both applied cause-and-effect tests for finding the state action that is a prerequisite to establishing a constitutional violation. But, in both cases, this test was applied in the context of school board actions that led to the "foreseeable" and "inevitable" result of segregated schools.

C. The Impact of *Keyes* on the *Cisneros-Austin I* Test

The Mexican-American intervenors argue that the cause-and-effect test need not fall by the wayside after *Keyes* because that case does not establish that segregative intent is a necessary element of unconstitutional school segregation. The intervenors point out that the *Keyes* holding is limited by the plaintiffs' concession in that case that they had the burden of proving intentional state action and by the obvious segregative purpose of the Denver school authorities. *See generally Hart v. Community*

School Board of Education, New York School District #21, 2 Cir. 1975, 512 F.2d 37, 49; Comment, Public School Segregation and the Contours of Unconstitutionality: The Denver School Board Case, 45 Colo. L.Rev. 457, 475 (1974). This Court has already rejected this argument. In *Morales v. Shannon,* 5 Cir. 1975, 516 F.2d 411, 412-13, *cert. denied,* 1975, —— U.S. ——, 96 S. Ct. 566, 46 L.Ed.2d 408, 44 U.S.L.W. 3358, we held:

> [W]ith respect to the first issue, segregatory intent, we are governed by *Keyes* . . . , which supervened our holding in *Cisneros* . . . , to the extent that *Keyes* requires, as a prerequisite to a decree to desegregate a de facto system, . . . proof of segregatory intent as a part of state action.

Morales also compels rejection of the intervenors' argument that the *Cisneros-Austin I* test for the constitutional violation is the "functional equivalent" of the *Keyes* test. To the extent that *Cisneros* and *Austin I* applied cause-and-effect tests and rejected the requirement of a showing of discriminatory intent, those cases were supervened by *Keyes.*

[4] But the intervenors also argue that, although this Court in *Cisneros* and *Austin I* refused to search for the defendants' express or specific intent, we did not discard intent as an element of the equal protection violation. The intervenors contend that intent could be inferred in those cases from our findings that segregation was the "inevitable result" and the "foreseeable consequence" of the school boards' actions. Whatever may have been the originally intended meaning of the tests we applied in *Cisneros* and *Austin I,* we agree with the intervenors that, after *Keyes,* our two opinions must be viewed as incorporating in school segregation law the ordinary rule of tort law that

a person intends the natural and foreseeable consequences of his actions.[4] This reading of *Cisneros* and *Austin I* is faithful to the *Keyes* requirement of proof of segregative intent. *See* Comment, 45 Colo. L.Rev. at 464 (1974). *But see* Comment, *Keyes v. School District No. 1*: Unlocking the Northern Schoolhouse Doors, 9 Harv.Civ.Rights-Civ.Lib.L.Rev. 124, 149 n.99 (1974).

---

[4]Prosser states the tort rule that "[i]ntent . . . extend[s] not only to those consequences which are desired, but also to those which the actor believes are substantially certain to follow from what he does". The Law of Torts § 8, at 31 (4th ed. 1971). The rule has also been applied in many other areas. *See, e.g., NLRB v. Great Dane Trailers,* 1967, 388 U.S. 26, 33, 87 S.Ct. 1792, 1797, 18 L.Ed.2d 1027, 1034 *quoting NLRB v. Erie Resistor Corp.,* 1963, 373 U.S. 221, 227, 228, 231, 83 S.Ct. 1139, 1144, 1145, 1147, 10 L.Ed.2d 308, 313, 314, 316 (discrimination against labor union member in violation of §8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act):

> Some conduct . . . is so 'inherently destructive of employee interests' that it may be deemed proscribed without need for proof of an underlying improper motive. . . . That is, some conduct carries with it 'unavoidable consequences which the employer not only foresaw but which he must have intended' and thus bears 'its own indicia of intent.'

Gomillion v. Lightfoot, 1960, 364 U.S. 339, 341, 347, 81 S.Ct. 125, 127, 130, 5 L.Ed.2d 110, 113, 116 (unconstitutionality of state statute redefining the boundaries of the City of Tuskegee), where, based on its observation that the "inevitable effect" of the redefinition of the City's boundaries was to remove almost all of its black voters, the Court observed that "the legislation is solely *concerned with*" segregating whites and blacks so as to deprive blacks of their vote, and that, *"to that end* [the Legislature] has incidentally changed the city's boundaries". (emphasis added). *Miller v. Milwaukee,* 1927, 272 U.S. 713, 715, 47 S.Ct. 280, 71 L.Ed. 487, 489 (validity of indirect state tax on federally tax-exempt income): "A result intelligently foreseen and offering the most obvious motive for an act that will bring it about, fairly may be taken to have been a purpose of the act."

Apart from the need to conform *Cisneros* and *Austin I* to the supervening *Keyes* case, there are other reasons for attributing responsibility to a state official who should reasonably foresee the segregative effects of his actions. First, it is difficult—and often futile—to obtain direct evidence of the official's intentions. Rather than announce his intention of violating antidiscrimination laws, it is far more likely that the state official "will pursue his discriminatory practices in ways that are devious, by methods subtle and illusive—for we deal with an area in which 'subleties of conduct . . . play no small part'". *Holland v. Edwards*, 1954, 307 N.Y. 38, 45, 119 N.E.2d 581, 584. *See also United States v. O'Brien*, 1968, 391 U.S. 367, 383-85, 88 S.Ct. 1673, 1682-1683, 20 L.Ed.2d 672, 683-684; Brest, Palmer v. Thompson: An Approach to the Problem of Unconstitutional Legislative Motive, 1971 Sup.Ct. Rev. 95, 124. Hence, courts usually rely on circumstantial evidence to ascertain the decisionmakers' motivations.[5]

[5] Second, in *Monroe v. Pape*, 1961, 365 U.S. 167, 187, 81 S.Ct. 473, 484, 5 L.Ed.2d 492, 505, the Supreme Court rejected the argument that specific intent is a necessary element of the cause of action under 42 U.S.C. §

---

[5] *See* Brest, 1971 Sup.Ct.Rev. at 120-21.

> The process does not differ from that of inferring ultimate facts from basic facts in other areas of the law. It is grounded in an experiential, intuitive assessment of the likelihood that the decision was designed to further one or another objective.

Id. at 121. *See also* Developments in the Law—Equal Protection, 82 Harv.L.Rev. 1065, 1077 (1969). Indeed, in *Keyes* the Supreme Court inferred the School Board's segregative intent with respect to one section of Denver (the core city) from evidence of intentional segregation in another area (Park Hill).

1983, the statute under which many school desegregation cases are brought. The Court held that § 1983 "should be read against the background of tort liability that makes a man responsible for the natural consequences of his actions". *Id.* We find no inconsistency between the rule applied in *Monroe v. Pape* and that applied in *Keyes*, nor do we find any reason for applying a standard different from *Monroe v. Pape* in school desegregation cases.[6] *See* Ely, Legislative and Administrative Motivation in Constitutional Law, 79 Yale L.J. 1205, 1292 n.258 (1970).

[6] One final word need be added about our *Austin I* formulation. Our holding that there was unlawful state-imposed segregation was based in part on our finding that affirmative action by the school authorities could have resulted in desegregation. 467 F.2d at 863. The AISD criticizes this approach because it would put

> virtually all school districts . . . under massive desegregation orders. Racial and ethnic imbalances occur wherever there are racial or ethnic minorities, and no school district can measure up to a standard which requires that it have taken affirmative action to

---

[6] We are not the first circuit to read the "natural and foreseeable consequences" test into the *Keyes* requirement of segregative intent. *See, e.g., Hart v. Community School Board of Education, New York School District #21*, 2 Cir. 1975, 512 F.2d 37, 50-51; *Morgan v. Kerrigan*, 1 Cir. 1974, 509 F.2d 580, *cert. denied*, 1975, 421 U.S. 963, 95 S.Ct. 1950, 44 L.Ed.2d 449; *Oliver v. Michigan State Board of Education*, 6 Cir. 1974, 508 F.2d 178, 182, *cert. denied*, 1975, 421 U.S. 963, 95 S.Ct. 1950, 44 L.Ed.2d 449. *But see Soria v. Oxnard School Board of Trustees*, 9 Cir. 1973, 488 F.2d 579, 585, *cert. denied*, 1974, 416 U.S. 951, 94 S.Ct. 1961, 40 L.Ed.2d 301. *See generally* Fiss, School Desegregation: The Uncertain Path of the Law, 4 Phil. & Pub. Affairs 3 (1974).

promote the integration of all racial and ethnic minorities throughout its history.

Our holding in *Austin I* placed no such burden on school boards. Our statement about affirmative action immediately followed our finding that the foreseeable consequence of various actions of the AISD was the segregation of Mexican-Americans. Hence, our holding of unlawful segregation was based on the foreseeability and avoidability of that segregation. *See* Fiss, The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Case—Its Significance for Northern School Desegregation, 38 U.Chi.L.Rev. 697, 706 (1971). Many circuits have taken this approach.[7] In any event, it should be clear after *Keyes* that the refusal of school authorities to take affirmative action that would desegregate the school system may be probative of the segregative intent underlying various actions of those officials.[8]

D. The Prima Facie Case of Unlawful Segregation of Mexican-Americans in Austin

[7] 1. *Segregation in the schools.* The district court found that there was substantial segregation of Mexican-Americans in the Austin school system. That finding is

[7]*See, e.g., Hart,* 512 F.2d at 50; *Morgan,* 509 F.2d at 585-86; *Oliver,* 508 F.2d at 187; *United States v. Board of School Commissioners of Indianapolis, Indiana,* 7 Cir. 1973, 474 F.2d 81, 89 *cert. denied,* 1973, 413 U.S. 920, 93 S.Ct. 3066, 37 L.Ed.2d 1041.

[8]Justice Powell, in a separate opinion, made the following observations about the approach of the *Keyes* majority: The Court "searches for *de jure* action in what the Denver School Board has done or failed to do". *Keyes,* 413 U.S. at 230, 92 S.Ct. at 2708, 37 L.Ed.2d at 575. "Every act of a school board and school administration, and indeed every failure to act where affirmative action is indicated, must now be subject to scrutiny." 413 U.S. at 234, 93 S.Ct. at 2710, 37 L.Ed.2d at 578.

not clearly erroneous. Our Court has held that "[u]nder *Keyes* . . . and *Cisneros* . . . , schools in Texas with a combined predominance of black and Mexican-American students are eligible to be classified as 'segregated schools'."[9] The statistics paint a clear picture of the extensive segregation that still exists in the Austin schools.[10] Of the 41, 174 students attending one of the 70 elementary and junior high schools in Austin, 16 percent (6590) are black, 24 percent (9950) are Mexican-American, and 60 percent (24,634) are Anglo. About 52 percent (3396) of the black pre-high school students and over 54 percent (5380) of the Mexican-American pre-high school students attend one of the 18 schools that is over three-fifths minority. Over 47 percent (11,610) of the Anglo pre-high school students in Austin attend one of the 24 schools that is over four-fifths Anglo.[11] Of the 17,746 public high school students in Austin, 14 percent (2520) are black, 19 percent (3316) are Mexican-American, and 67 percent (11,910) are Anglo. About 17 percent (423) of the black high school students and over 30 percent (1003) of the

[9]*Arvizu v. Waco Independent School District,* 5 Cir. 1974, 495 F.2d 499, 505 N. 10. *See also Keyes,* 413 U.S. at 197, 93 S.Ct. at 2691, 37 L.Ed.2d at 556.

[10]In citing these statistics, we recall the words of *United States v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ.,* 5 Cir. 1966, 372 F.2d 836, 887, *aff'd en banc,* 1967, 380 F.2d 387, *cert. denied,* 1967, 389 U.S. 840, 88 S.Ct. 67, 19 L.Ed.2d 103:

> A similar inference [of deliberate discrimination against Negroes] may be drawn in school desegregation cases, when the number of Negroes attending school with white children is manifestly out of line with the ratio of Negro school children to white school children in public schools.

[11]Another 18 percent (4358) of the Anglo elementary and junior high school students attend one of the 8 schools that is between 75 and 80 percent Anglo.

Mexican-American students attend Johnston High School, which is 99 percent minority. Over 55 percent (655) of the Anglo high school students in Austin attend one of the 3 schools that is over four-fifths Anglo.

[8] 2. *Segregative actions taken with segregative intent.* It has been the AISD's policy to assign students to the schools closest to their homes. The City of Austin, with the exception of the strip between East and West Austin, has ethnically segregated housing patterns.[12] Hence, the natural, foreseeable, and inevitable result of the AISD's student assignment policy has been segregated schools throughout most of the city. Moreover, as we found in *Austin I,* "[a]ffirmative action to the contrary would have resulted in desegregation". 467 F.2d at 863. The inference is inescapable: the AISD has intended, by its continued use of the neighborhood assignment policy, to maintain segregated schools in East and West Austin.[13]

---

[12]East Austin is bordered on the north by East Nineteenth Street and the airport, on the south by the Colorado River, on the west by Interstate Highway 35, and on the east by the AISD boundary line. We found in *Austin I* that 64 percent of the City's Mexican-Americans live in East Austin. A large portion of the remaining Mexican-Americans live in the area between East and West Austin.

[13]The same conclusion is inferable from other evidence as well. We held in *Austin I*

> that the AISD has, in its choice of school site locations, construction and renovation of schools, drawing of attendance zones, student assignment and transfer policies, and faculty and staff assignments, caused and perpetuated the segregation of Mexican-American students within the school system.

467 F.2d at 865–66. We also found that "[t]he natural and foreseeable consequence of these actions was segregation of Mexican-Americans". 467 F.2d at 863. The Supreme Court inferred segregative intent from the same kind of circumstantial evidence in *Keyes.* See 413 U.S.

The plaintiffs have therefore established a prima facie case of *de jure* segregation of Mexican-Americans in all portions of the school district except the residentially integrated central city area.[14]

E. The AISD's Attempted Rebuttal of the Prima Facie Showing of Segregative Intent

The AISD offers numerous arguments to justify the acts that we criticized in *Austin I* as segregating Mexican-American students in the Austin school system. For the second time, we reject these arguments.

The AISD contends that Mexican-Americans were segregated before 1950 not because of their ethnic background but because they had language difficulties or were the children of migrant workers and needed special educational considerations. We answered this argument in *Austin I:*

> We are not convinced that, to meet the special educational needs of Mexican-American children, the

---

at 192, 93 S.Ct. at 2689, 37 L.Ed.2d at 553. The inference of segregative intent that the Supreme Court made regarding the Denver school authorities is equally applicable to their counterparts in Austin.

[14]The district court held that the AISD had, in the past, assigned black students for the purpose of promoting segregation. The plaintiffs argue that this finding of *de jure* segregation in a substantial portion of the Austin school district triggers the *Keyes* presumption of unlawful segregation in the remainder of the district. The AISD responds that this *Keyes* presumption is inapplicable to the case before us because "[t]he existence of a statutorily based black-white system has no probative value with respect to concentrations of Mexican-American students when the Mexican-American Students were classified and treated as white under the dual system". *See Higgins v. Bd. of Educ. of Grand Rapids,* 6 Cir. 1974, 508 F.2d 779, 789. We need not resolve this dispute about the *Keyes* presumption because, even without this presumption, we conclude that the AISD has taken actions intentionally calculated to segregate the Mexican-American students throughout the district.

> AISD had to keep these children in separate schools, isolate them in Mexican-American neighborhoods, or prevent them from sharing in the educational, social, and psychological benefits of an integrated education.

467 F.2d at 869. We concluded that the AISD intentionally acted to segregate Mexican-Americans in the pre-*Brown* years.[15]

[9] The AISD then argues that, even if the early special programs are viewed as intentional segregation, no causal relationship exists between them and the present Mexican-American concentrations in the schools. We rejected this argument in *Austin I* when we held that the post-1950 AISD actions perpetuated the pre-1950 segregation.[16] We now reaffirm our previous rejection of this AISD contention.

The AISD's primary argument with regard to its post-1950 actions is that, although the location of new schools and the drawing of attendance zones for those schools had "the inevitable and unavoidable result" of increasing the concentrations of Mexican-Americans in the East Austin schools, this segregation resulted from the preexisting residential patterns and not from segregative motives of the AISD. This Court recently rejected a sim-

---

[15]"[T]he AISD used dual-overlapping attendance zones, student assignment policies, and site selection to segregate Mexican-American students in the years prior to 1954.

467 F.2d at 867.

[16]"After the Supreme Court decision in Brown, the AISD nominally undertook to abolish the dual system based on separate schools for blacks and whites. But the board continued to perpetuate segregation of Mexican Americans.

467 F.2d at 867.

ilar argument in *Morales v. Shannon,* 5 Cir. 1975, 516 F.2d 411, 413, *cert. denied,* 1975, ____ U.S. ____, 96 S.Ct. 566, 46 L.Ed.2d 408, 44 U.S.L.W. 3358:

> the imposition of the neighborhood assignment system froze the Mexican-American students into the Robb and Anthon schools. There could have been no other result and this is strong evidence of segregatory intent.

See also United States v. Midland Independent School District, 5 Cir. 1975, 519 F.d 60, *cert. denied,* 1976, ____ U.S. ____, 96 S.Ct. 1106, 47 L.Ed.2d 314. *United States v. Jefferson County Board of Education*, 5 Cir. 1966, 372 F.2d 836, 876, 879-80, *aff'd en banc*, 1967, 380 F.2d 385, *cert. denied*, 1967, 389 U.S. 840, 88 S.Ct. 67, 19 L.Ed.2d 103.

In rejecting for a second time these contentions of the AISD, we reaffirm—hopefully for the last time—the words of *United States v. Midland Independent School District,* 519 F.2d at 64:

> the facts in the Austin and Corpus Christi cases, however, as in this case, show an overriding intent by the school boards in those districts to isolate, to segregate, Mexican-Americans and blacks.

[10-12] Finally, we think it important to draw attention to a basic misconception of the AISD, on which a great deal of its argument relies. This misconception goes to the heart of the responsibilities of school authorities to provide equal educational opportunities for the students in their districts. The AISD has argued that "[u]nder *Keyes,* the school district was prohibited from segregating Mexican-American students, but it was under no duty to take affirmative action to attempt to avoid Mexican-American concentrations in the schools which resulted from residen-

tial concentrations". At least in the Texas schools, where we have held that Mexican-American students are entitled to the same benefits of *Brown* as are blacks, school authorities may not constitutionally use a neighborhood assignment policy creating segregated schools in a district with ethnically segregated residential patterns. A segregated school system is the foreseeable and inevitable result of such an assignment policy. When this policy is used, we may infer that the school authorities have acted with segregative intent.

The segregation is *de jure* and unconstitutional because it is the result of school board action taken with the obvious (though not necessarily predominant) intent to create or maintain segregated schools. School authorities are then "clearly charged with the affirmative duty to take whatever steps might be necessary to convert to a unitary system in which racial discrimination would be eliminated root and branch". *Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, Virginia,* 1968, 391 U.S. 430, 437-38, 88 S.Ct. 1689, 1694, 20 L.Ed.2d 716, 723. As articulated in *Austin I,* the case before us presents not only the use of a neighborhood assignment policy in a residentially segregated school district, but also the taking of an extensive series of actions dating back to the early twentieth century that had the natural, foreseeable, and avoidable result of creating and maintaining an ethnically segregated school system. The AISD must convert this "still-functioning dual system to a unitary, non-[ethnic] system—lock, stock, and barrel". *United States v. Jefferson County Board of Education,* 372 F.2d at 878.

III. SEGREGATION OF BLACKS

The district court held that "the AISD . . . has engaged in discriminatory assignment of black students to promote segregation" and ordered the AISD to dismantle its dual school system and convert to an integrated, unitary school system. These holdings have not been challenged on appeal. They are affirmed.

IV. THE REMEDY

A. The "Desegregation Plan" Adopted by the District Court

1. *The Plan.* The district court adopted whole the Sixth Grade Center Plan submitted by the AISD. We begin our analysis of this plan by stating what the AISD did not attempt to accomplish through it. The AISD views the junior and senior high schools in Austin as totally desegregated and, therefore, its plan does not further integrate those schools. The AISD, as noted above, does not believe that it has the duty to desegregate the Mexican-Americans and, hence, its plan has only an incidental effect on these students. Finally, the AISD contends that complete desegregation of the elementary schools would require "massive crosstown busing" of 6-10 year olds, which it views as undesirable, and, therefore, its desegregation plan is limited to the sixth grade.

> As the AISD describes it,
> [t]he Sixth Grade Center Plan essentially establishes six elementary schools in different geographic parts of the School District as centers for all sixth-grade students in the School District. Those buildings

> which are not serving as elementary schools and would become the sixth-grade centers would be emptied of all students K through grade 5 so the building would be available for the Sixth Grade Center. Students in those schools would be assigned to the nearest available elementary school.

The plan would also set up sixth grades at two of the junior high schools in Austin. Of the six Sixth Grade Centers, two would have Anglo populations of over 80 percent; the sixth grade populations at the two junior high schools would be about 97 percent minority. The AISD estimates that the plan would require the busing of about 1900 students, and that about 62 percent of those students would be Anglo.

In an effort to provide equal educational opportunities for all of its students, the AISD has also approved the employment of two assistant superintendents, one to be Mexican-American and one to be black; established majority-to-minority transfer provisions for both black and Mexican-American students; begun to develop a bilingual educational program; made several changes in boundary lines assertedly to produce a better racial and ethnic composition in the city schools; and established an advisory committee to investigate and propose programs for minority students that may be used in Austin.

[13* 2. *The Plan's deficiences.* As we did in *Austin I*, we congratulate the AISD for some of the creative educational techniques it has proposed and adopted for equalizing educational opportunities of minority students in Austin. We cannot applaud, however, the channeling of the AISD's creative abilities into new methods of circumventing its "affirmative duty to take whatever steps might be necessary to convert to a unitary system in which

racial [and ethnic] discrimination would be eliminated root and branch". *Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, Virginia*, 1968, 391 U.S. 430, 437-38, 88 S.Ct. 1689, 1694, 20 L.Ed.2d 716, 723. The first elementary school "desegregation plan" that the AISD presented to the district court provided for meetings of students one week per month to participate in certain cultural activities. We reversed the district court's adoption of this plan, holding that "[p]art-time desegregation does not meet constitutional requirements".[11] 467 F.2d at 872. On remand, the district court adopted the AISD's new "desegregation plan", which leaves untouched the students in grades K-5 and 7-12. For reasons similar to those that underlay our rejection of the AISD's plan in *Austin I*, we again hold that the AISD-district court plan is constitutionally deficient. The constitutional duty of the school authorities is to establish a unitary *system*, not a unitary grade.

---

[11] In *Tasby v. Estes*, 5 Cir. 1975, 517 F.2d 92, *cert. denied*, 1975, 423 U.S. 939, 96 S.Ct. 299, 46 L.Ed.2d 271, 44 U.S.L.W. 3264, we held another "part-time" desegregation plan constitutionally deficient. The unique feature of the plan submitted there by the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) and adopted by the district court was the requirement that there be a minimum of one hour a day of contact between the races through two-way oral and visual television communication between two or more schools. We held:

> The Supreme Court has made it clear that nothing less than the elimination of predominantly one-race schools is constitutionally required in the disestablishment of a dual school system based upon segregation of the races. For this reason, the district court's elementary school "television plan" must be rejected as a legitimate technique for the conversion of the DISD from a dual to a unitary educational system.

517 F.2d at 103.

[14, 15] The AISD offers two arguments in support of its failure to desegregate grades K to 5. Both are meritless.

First it cites the Supreme Court's holding that

> the district judge or school authorities should make every effort to achieve the greatest possible degree of actual desegregation, taking into account the practicalities of the situation.

Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County, 1971, 402 U.S. 33, 37, 91 S.Ct. 1289, 1292, 28 L.Ed.2d 577, 581. The only "practicality" it specifies is the vague, conclusory, and unsupported assertion that children under 10 years old should not be bused for the purpose of desegregation. But busing, a "normal and accepted tool of educational policy", cannot be rejected without an evidentiary showing that "the time or distance of travel is so great as to risk either the health of the children or significantly impinge on the educational process". *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, 1971, 402 U.S. 1, 29, 30–31, 91 S.Ct. 1267, 1283, 28 L.Ed.2d 554, 575.

[16] The AISD's only other defense of the exclusion of kindergarten-to-fifth-grade students from its desegregation plan is that the black intervenors and the United States should be precluded from objecting to the Sixth Grade Center Plan because they submitted no plan of their own. The Mexican-American intervenors, however, did propose a desegregation plan, in which the black intervenors concurred. And, as to the United States, although we are disappointed by their noncompliance with the district judge's request that they submit a plan, we find no basis for denying them the right to criticize the plan submitted by the AISD.

The plan adopted by the district court also fails to comply with the mandate of *Austin I*. The eight concurring judges in that case held that

> [w]here a student assignment plan is found to be unconstitutional, as here, because of the existence of segregation which has been imposed by statute or by official act against blacks and an identifiable ethnic group (here the Mexican-American students), it is the duty of the school officials to forthwith formulate and implement such student assignment plan as will remedy the discrimination which has been found to exist.

467 F.2d at 884. We held in Parts II and III of this opinion that official discrimination against blacks and Mexican-Americans has infected almost the entire Austin school system. The discrimination has prevented most minority students in the district from securing educational opportunities equal to those of their Anglo counterparts. The AISD's submission of a "desegregation plan" that would provide an integrated education for only sixth grade students simply does not fulfill the AISD's duty to remedy that discrimination.

[17, 18] The plan submitted by the AISD would assign students in grades K to 5 to the schools closest to their homes. The district court's adoption of this plan is directly contrary to the holding in *Austin I* that

> [it] is apparent that [assignment on a strict neighborhood basis] will not suffice in the AISD although it may suffice as to some schools. To the extent that it does not suffice, the district court will proceed to employ other methods of desegregation.

The *Austin I* majority also held that if, after trying the pairing or clustering of schools, the realignment of school

assignment zones, and the relocation of portable school rooms, "proscribed segregated schools still exist, the court must consider the pairing or clustering of schools in non-contiguous school zones". 467 F.2d at 885. It was an abuse of discretion for the court to refuse to give serious consideration to the last desegregation method despite the concession of the AISD that

> [c]ountless efforts by school officials, consultants, and visiting team shave found it impossible to produce significant desegregation by boundary line changes, contiguous pairing of schools, magnet schools, or other effective means short of massive crosstown busing incident to non-contiguous pairing of . . . schools . . . .[18]

[19] 3. *The closing of Anderson High School and Kealing Junior High School.* In his first opinion in this case, the district judge ordered the closing of two all-black schools, Anderson and Kealing.[19] The students from those

[18]The federal courts may adopt desegregation remedies requiring busing only as a last resort. *See* 20 U.S.C. §§ 1713, 1755. In the case before us, however, we find that crosstown busing is the only desegregation method that will work. This finding is supported not only by the above-quoted statement of the AISD but also by the residential patterns in Austin. In school districts with segregated neighborhoods, "[d]esegregation plans cannot be limited to the walk-in school". *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ.* 1971, 402 U.S. 1, 30, 91 S.Ct. 1267, 1283, 28 L.Ed.2d 554, 575. Hence the federal statutes do not bar the court-ordered transportation of students in Austin.

[19]At the time Anderson High School was closed, it was 98 percent black and its student body constituted about 44 percent of the black high school population in the Austin school district. Kealing Junior High School was also 98 percent black and its student body constituted 46 percent of the black junior high school students in the district. *See Austin I,* 467 F.2d at 876-77, Appendix A.

schools were to be transferred to other schools in the system. Six judges concluded in *Austin I* that the schools were closed for racial reasons and, hence, the closings were unacceptable. 467 F.2d at 872. The remaining eight judges did not consider this issue. On remand, the district court found that the school closings were based on nonracial considerations. This finding is clearly erroneous. The AISD concedes, as it must, that a primary reason for the school closings was the fear that whites would flee the school system rather than send their children to these East Austin schools. It is hardly a new principle of constitutional law that this fear is an impermissible basis for closing public schools. *See, e.g., United States v. Hendry County School District,* 5 Cir. 1974, 504 F.2d 550, 553.

Kealing Junior High School must therefore be reopened and used as part of the regular public school program of the District. The district court approved the conversion of Anderson High School into Austin Community College, and the conversion has already taken place. Because it has closed Anderson as a high school, the AISD on remand should present a program that will permit the burdens of desegregation to be as fairly distributed as they would have been if Anderson had not been converted into a community college.[20]

B. The Finger Plan

1. *The Plan.* The Mexican-American intervenors submitted a desegregation plan prepared by Dr. John A. Finger, Jr., a professor of education at Rhode Island Col-

[20]For example, through the construction of a new high school in East Austin.

lege.[21] The "Finger Plan" would convert the school system to a 4-4-4 grade structure, that is, elementary schools would contain grades K to 4, middle schools would contain grades 5 to 8, and high schools would continue to operate grades 9 to 12. All students in grades K to 4 in elementary schools that are over 50 percent minority would be bused to elementary schools that are over 90 percent Anglo. Fifth-to-eighth-grade students in schools that are over 90 percent Anglo would be bused to schools that are over 50 percent minority. The practical effect of the Plan is that kindergarten-to-fourth-grade students in East Austin would be bused to West Austin and fifth-to-eighth-grade students in West Austin would be bused to East Austin. Elementary and junior high schools that are between 50 and 90 percent Anglo are defined as "naturally desegregated" and would remain unchanged. When changing demographic patterns cause any of these schools to fall outside of the "naturally desegregated" range, the schools would be brought within the Finger Plan 4-4-4 system. The high schools would be integrated by selecting, for each high school, feeder schools that would maximize the integration of that high school. Dr. Finger estimates that 18,659 (the AISD says 25,000) of Austin's public school students would be bused under his plan.[22]

[21]Dr. Finger is a recognized authority in the area of school desegregation and has designed the plans presently being used in several cities. He prepared, for example, the plan for Charlotte, North Carolina, which was approved by the Supreme Court in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ.*, 1971, 402 U.S. 1, 91 S.Ct. 1267, 28 L.Ed.2d 554.

[22]The Finger Plan would therefore require the busing of about 32 percent (42 percent according to the AISD's estimate) of the Austin students. This is comparable to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North

[20] 2. *The AISD's objections to the Finger Plan.* The AISD's first objection to the Finger Plan is that it is counter-productive in that it requires kindergarten-to-fourth-grade Anglo students attending schools in minority areas to be bused along with minority students to schools in Anglo areas; it also requires fifth-to-eighth-grade minority students going to predominantly Anglo schools to be bused along with their Anglo classmates to minority areas. These results are dictated by the feature of the Finger Plan that requires *all* students in the relevant grades at "sending schools" to be bused to the designated "receiving schools". About 357 Anglos presently attending minority schools and about 168 minority students presently attending Anglo schools will be bused to the new schools.[23] These students represent only about 1 percent of

Carolina school system, which, before the Supreme Court's 1971 desegregation order, planned to bus 27 percent of its students "without regard to desegregation plans", and the Mobile County, Alabama school system, which bused 30 percent of its students before the Supreme Court's 1971 desegregation order. *See Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ.*, 1971, 402 U.S. 1, 6, 29 n. 11, 91 S.Ct. 1267, 1271, 28 L.Ed.2d 554, 561; *Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County*, 1971, 402 U.S. 33, 34, 91 S.Ct. 1289, 1290, 28 L.Ed.2d 577, 579. Moreover, the Supreme Court noted in *Swann* that about 39 percent of this country's public school children were bused to their schools in 1969–70. 402 U.S. at 29, 91 S.Ct. at 1282, 28 L.Ed.2d at 574.

[23]The AISD has calculated that the correct figures are 535 Anglos and 336 minority students. These numbers are too high because the AISD has assumed that *all* students at elementary and junior high schools over 50 percent minority or 90 percent Anglo would be bused to new elementary or middle schools outside of their neighborhoods. The Finger Plan, however, would bus only kindergarten-to-fourth-grade students from the elementary schools in East Austin and fifth-to-eighth-grade students from the elementary and junior high schools

the pre-high school students in Austin. These percentages are simply not substantial enough to invalidate the entire desegregation plan. If, on remand, the district court concludes that a constitutionally sufficient degree of desegregation can be achieved without busing these 525 students across town, the Finger Plan may be so modified.

The AISD also criticizes the Finger Plan because the newly created elementary and middle schools would be (by the AISD's estimate) about 54 percent minority, although the entire Austin pre-high school system is only about 40 percent minority. This discrepancy is due to the fact that the "naturally desegregated" schools left untouched by the Finger Plan are substantially more than 60 percent Anglo. Thus, Dr. Finger would permit a disproportionately large number of Anglo students to remain at their present schools.

[21] The Supreme Court has held that "[t]he constitutional command to desegregate schools does not mean that every school in every community must always reflect the racial composition of the school system as a whole". *Swann*, 402 U.S. at 24, 91 .Ct. at 1280, 28 L.Ed.2d at 571. But the Court later held in the same opinion that "[t]he district judge or school authorities should make every effort to achieve the greatest possible degree of actual desegregation . . . ." 402 U.S. at 26, 91S.Ct. at 1281, 28 L.Ed.2d at 572. Such an effort must be made by the district court on remand.[24]

---

in West Austin. Hence, the AISD estimates are about one-third too high for the Anglo students at minority schools in East Austin and about one-half too high for the minority students at Anglo schools in West Austin.

[24]Quotas may be a starting point for the district court, but are not an ironclad requirement. *See Milliken v. Bradley*. 1974, 418 U.S. 717, 740–41, 94 S.Ct. 3112, 3125, 41 L.Ed.2d 1069, 1088–89; *North Carolina Bd. of Educ. v. Swann*, 1971, 402 U.S. 43, 46, 91 S.Ct. 1284, 1286, 28 L.Ed.2d 586, 589.

[22] The AISD also argues that the 4-4-4 school system, though perhaps logical for the purpose of facilitating school desegregation, is basically inconsistent with sound educational principles. This argument is based solely on the testimony of Dr. Jack Davidson, the Superintendent of Schools for the AISD, that placing fifth graders in the same schools (the middle schools) with students four years older "at that period of time—it is the developmental age—produces all kinds of problems". Even if that statement is considered persuasive, these "problems" can be solved when a final plan is constructed on remand. Dr. Finger testified that his plan could, and perhaps should, be modified to a 5-3-4 system. This plan would replace the middle schools with junior high schools housing the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades.

[23] The AISD next brings to our attention several problems that would be created by the Finger Plan busing program. It first argues that the Plan would require the busing of students "in a basic east-west pattern through a traffic system which provides no adequate east-west arteries". Moreover, the AISD continues, the students would have to be bused through the large complex of the downtown business area, the state office buildings, and the University of Texas, and this would produce a highly congested traffic situation. The AISD also cites the eco-

nomic cost of the busing, the difficulty of obtaining sufficient fuel, and the inevitability of "white flight", which would render the Plan ineffective as a desegregation device.[25]

[24] We think it is important to point out first the reason these remedial costs are relevant to judicial decisionmaking in a school desegregation case. We point this out because the AISD seems to be arguing that these costs are relevant to the determination whether there is a constitutional violation, that is, that the court must decide that the harmfulness of the school segregation is sufficient to justify the remedial costs of correcting that segregation. *See generally* Fiss, The Jurisprudence of Busing, 39 Law & Contemp.Prob. 194 (1975). We disagree.

---

[25]The AISD contends that whites will flee the Austin public school system to attend private schools and public schools in surrounding school districts. As a result, the AISD concludes that the plan fails to meet the standard of *Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County,* 1971, 402 U.S. 33, 37, 91 S.Ct. 1289, 1292, 28 L.Ed.2d 577, 581: "The measure of any desegregation plan is its effectiveness." The district court was presented with two desegregation plans, the AISD Plan, which would desegregate only the sixth grade, and the Finger Plan, which would desegregate the entire school system. It is wholly speculative whether white flight will eventually render the Finger Plan less effective than the AISD Plan in transforming the AISD into a unitary system. It is beyond dispute, however, that the Finger Plan is the more effective desegregation device for the immediate future. For this reason, and others that we have specified in this opinion, it was an abuse of discretion for the district court to adopt the AISD Plan. *See United States v. Bd. of School Commissioners of Indianapolis, Indiana,* 7 Cir. 1974, 503 F.2d 68, 75–76, *cert. denied,* 1973, 413 U.S. 920, 93 S.Ct. 3066, 37 L.Ed.2d 1041.

The Supreme Court stated the controlling principle in *Swann,* 402 U.S. at 15–16, 91 S.Ct. at 1276, 28 L.Ed.2d at 566:

> a school desegregation case does not differ fundamentally from other cases involving the framing of equitable remedies to repair the denial of a constitutional right. The task is to correct, by a balancing of the individual and collective interests, the condition that offends the Constitution.

In other words, there are two separate phases to a school desegregation case. First, the Court must determine whether there is *de jure* segregation. This decision, in cases such as the one before us, conforms with the standards of *Keyes*. Second, the Court must decide upon a remedy. It is at this point that the balancing of interests becomes relevant.[26] In this phase of the case, the Court must determine

---

[26]The Court stated in *Brown II* that, in determining whether school authorities should be given additional time to carry out the desegregation remedy, "the courts may consider problems related to administration, arising from the physical condition of the school plant, the school transportation system, personnel . . . ." 349 U.S. 294 at 300, 75 S.Ct. 753, 99 L.Ed. 1083. The *Brown II* Court, however, carefully limited its approval of consideration of these problems to the delay issue. *See also Watson v. Memphis,* 1963, 373 U.S. 526, 532–33, 83 S.Ct. 1314, 1318, 10 L.Ed.2d 529, 534–35.

The AISD's arguments that its school district should not be ordered to desegregate "root and branch" because of economic cost and the specter of white flight have already been rejected by the Supreme Court. In *Watson,* 373 U.S. at 537–38, 83 S.Ct. at 1320–21, 10 L.Ed.2d 537–38, the Court was unpersuaded by the argument that desegregation of the Memphis parks should be delayed because of the expenses it would generate:

the least costly method of correcting the constitutional violation.[27] But the above quote from *Swann* leaves no doubt that, however, the balancing of interests is resolved, the constitutional violation must be corrected.

[25] We therefore direct the district court, in completing the desegregation plan for Austin, to minimize the economic cost of busing, the traffic congestion that the busing plan will cause, the time that school children must spend on the buses, and the number of students who will leave the public school system rather than participate in the desegregation plan.[28] The overriding judicial goal,

---

it is obvious that vindication of conceded constitutional rights cannot be made dependent upon any theory that it is less expensive to deny them to afford them. We will not assume that the citizens of Memphis accept the questionable premise implicit in this argument or that either the resources of the city are inadequate, or its government unresponsive, to the needs of all of its citizens.

And the Court has repeatedly held that segregative state action must be terminated and remedied despite public disagreement with the constitutional principles. *See, e. g., United States v. Scotland Neck City Bd. of Educ.*, 1971, 407 U.S. 484, 490–91, 92 S.Ct. 2214, 2217–18, 33 L.Ed.2d 75, 80–81; *Watson*, 373 U.S. at 535, 83 S.Ct. at 1319, 10 L.Ed.2d at 536; *Cooper v. Aaron*, 1958, 358 U.S. 1, 16, 78 S.Ct. 1401, 1408, 3 L.Ed.2d 5, 15: *Brown II*, 349 U.S. at 300, 75 S.Ct. at 756, 99 L.Ed. at 1106; *Buchanan v. Waley*, 1917, 245 U.S. 60, 81, 38 S.Ct. 16, 20, 62 L.Ed. 149, 163.

[27]*See* Fiss, 39 Law & Contemp.Prob. at 198. Professor Fiss correctly points out that "[t]he court need not choose the remedy that has the best cost-benefit relationship since it may eliminate a smaller portion of the harm". Id.

[28]On the issue of "white flight", the district court should accord appropriate weight to the following testimony of Dr. Finger:

> [M]y thought in preparing this plan was to minimize the public anguish over busing as much as possible, that there isn't any way that one can overcome it, but my attempt was to minimize it as much as possible.

however, must be "the development of a decree 'that promises realistically to work, and promises realistically to work now.'". *Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County*, 402 U.S. at 38, 91 S.Ct. at 1292, 28 L.Ed.2d at 581, *quoting Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, Virginia*, 1968, 391 U.S. 430, 439, 88 S.Ct. 1689, 1694, 20 L.Ed.2d 716, 724.

C. Formulation of the Desegregation Decree

[26] We affirm the district court order that the AISD continue in its active efforts to recruit Mexican-American teachers. The AISD should work "toward the achievement, as a goal, of a ratio of mexican-american teachers to total faculty that approaches the ratio of mexican-american students to the total student population". *Cisneros*, 467 F.2d at 151-52. Moreover, the ratio of Mexican-American to Anglo teachers in each school should be substantially the same as it is throughout the district. *See United States v. Montgomery County Board of Education*, 1969, 395 U.S. 225, 89 S.Ct. 1670, 23 L.Ed.2d 263. We have already held that the AISD has adequately desegregated its faculty on a black-white basis. *Austin I*, 467 F.2d at 870 n. 37.

[27] The AISD had an ongoing bilingual-bicultural education program that the Superintendent of Schools testified would continue "regardless of the level of federal funding". Indeed, state and federal law require as much. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1703(f); Tex.Educ.Code Ann. § 21.451 et seq. (1975 pocket part). *See also Lau v. Nichols*, 1974, 414 U.S. 563, 94 S.Ct. 786, 39 L.Ed.2d 1. The district court properly made this commitment a part of its decree.

[28] We held in *United States v. Board of Public Instruction of Polk County, Florida,* 5 Cir. 1968, 395 F.2d 66, 69, that

> [t]here is an affirmative duty, overriding all other considerations with respect to the locating of new schools, except where inconsistent with "proper operation of the school system as a whole" to *seek* means to eradicate the vestiges of the dual system.

See also Swann, 402 U.S. at 20–21, 91 S.Ct. at 1278, 28 L.Ed.2d at 569; *Tasby v. Estes,* 5 Cir. 1975, 517 F.2d 92, 104–06, *cert. denied,* 1975, 423 U.S. 939, 96 S.Ct. 299, 46 L.Ed.2d 271. The district court was therefore correct in incorporating into its order the commitment of the AISD to locate newly constructed schools in such a manner as to maximize integration. When formulating the Austin desegregation decree on remand, the district court should approve new school sites only if they would operate, within the context of the new desegregation decree, to maximize integration in the district.

[29] We suggest that the district court consider appointing a master to draft a comprehensive tri-ethnic desegregation plan consistent with this opinion and the decisions of the United States Supreme Court.[29] The plan should conform to one of the approaches outlined by Dr. Finger in his written submission of August 14, 1972, and in his testimony.

---

[29]The AISD should provide staff assistance to the master or expert upon his request. *See, e. g., United States v. Bd. of School Commissioners of Indianapolis, Indiana,* 7 Cir. 1974, 503 F.2d 68, 78, *cert. denied,* 1973, 413 U.S. 920, 93 S.Ct. 3066, 37 L.Ed.2d 1041; *Bradley v. Milliken,* 6 Cir. 1973, 484 F.2d 215, 252, *rev'd on other grounds, 1974, 418 U.S. 717, 94 S.Ct. 3112, 41 L.Ed.2d 1069.*

V. CONCLUSION

[30] Finally, the intervenors are entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees. *See* § 718 of Title VII of the Emergency School Aid Act of 1972, 20 U.S.C. § 1617; *Bradley v. School Board of Richmond,* 1974, 416 U.S. 696, 94 S.Ct. 2006, 40 L.Ed.2d 476; *Henry v. Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District,* 5 Cir. 1973, 480 F.2d at 583. The district court should conduct evidentiary proceedings to determine the proper amount of fees to be awarded.

We have today held, for the second time, that a desegregation plan submitted by the AISD is constitutionally insufficient. Blacks and Mexican-Americans in Austin have waited a long time for the unitary school system that the constitution requires. We suggest that the district court move expeditiously on remand to provide Austin minority students with such a system.

We reverse the judgment of the district court and remand the case for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. The mandate of the Court shall issue forthwith. The district court should consider appointing a master to prepare a comprehensive desegregation plan. The desegregation plan adopted by the district court in 1973 may be continued only as a stop-gap.

AFFIRMED IN PART, REVERSED IN PART, AND REMANDED.

APPENDIX
AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF STUDENTS*
1975-76

School	*Total*	*Black*	*Mexican-American*	*Anglo*
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS				
Anderson	2432	219	57	2156
		(9)	(2)	(89)
Austin	1842	210	502	1130
		(12)	(27)	(61)
Crockett	3095	239	299	2557
		(8)	(10)	(82)
L. B. Johnson	1656	388	127	1141
		(23)	(8)	(69)
Johnston	1441	423	1003	15
		(29)	(70)	(1)
Lanier	2285	291	151	1843
		(13)	(6)	(81)
McCallum	1407	94	203	1110
		(7)	(14)	(79)
Reagan	1688	502	171	1015
		(30)	(10)	(60)
Travis	1900	154	803	943
		(8)	(42)	(50)
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS TOTALS	17,746	2520	3316	11,910
		(14)	(19)	(67)

Derived from October 10, 1975 submission of the AISD. Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

School	*Total*	*Black*	*Mexican-American*	*Anglo*
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS				
Allan	836	268	575	20
		(31)	(67)	(2)
Bedichek	1168	75	181	912
		(6)	(16)	(78)
Burnet	1029	139	70	820
		(13)	(7)	(80)
Dobie	1110	206	118	786
		(18)	(11)	(71)
Fulmore	921	83	431	407
		(9)	(47)	(44)
Lamar	750	50	133	567
		(7)	(18)	(75)
Martin	957	74	851	32
		(8)	(89)	(3)
Murchison	873	109	18	746
		(13)	(2)	(85)
O. Henry	694	57	80	557
		(8)	(12)	(80)
Pearce	1308	435	104	769
		(33)	(8)	(59)
Porter	934	105	147	682
		(11)	(16)	(73)
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS TOTALS	10,607	1601	2708	6298
		(15)	(26)	(59)

School	*Total*	*Black*	*Mexican-American*	*Anglo*
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS				
Allison	714	106	580	28
		(15)	(81)	(4)
Andrews	515	129	36	350
		(25)	(7)	(68)
Baker	489	47	102	340
		(10)	(21)	(69)
Barrington	654	13	80	561
		(2)	(12)	(86)
Barton Hills	317	4	11	302
		(1)	(4)	(95)
Becker	711	68	521	122
		(10)	(73)	(17)
Blackshear	450	436	14	—
		(97)	(3)	
Blanton	616	207	63	346
		(34)	(10)	(56)
Brentwood	547	22	99	426
		(4)	(18)	(78)
Brooke	389	3	377	9
		(1)	(97)	(2)
Brown	548	119	151	278
		(22)	(27)	(51)
Bryker Woods	244	2	20	222
		(1)	(8)	(91)
Campbell	468	460	6	2
		(98)	(1)	(1)
Casis	591	20	32	539
		(3)	(6)	(91)
Cook	668	26	85	557
		(4)	(13)	(83)
Cunningham	806	10	90	706
		(1)	(11)	(88)

School	*Total*	*Black*	*Mexican-American*	*Anglo*
Dawson	693	41	442	210
		(6)	(64)	(30)
Dill	114	3	7	104
		(3)	(6)	(91)
Doss	626	10	7	609
		(2)	(1)	(97)
Govalle	698	167	501	30
		(24)	(72)	(4)
Graham	400	11	29	360
		(3)	(7)	(90)
Gullett	481	—	7	474
			(1)	(99)
Harris	590	120	72	398
		(20)	(12)	(68)
Highland Park	408	4	13	391
		(1)	(3)	(96)
Hill	551	5	6	540
		(1)	(1)	(98)
Joslin	947	94	130	723
		(10)	(14)	(76)
Lee	260	36	47	177
		(14)	(18)	(68)
Linder	624	47	99	478
		(7)	(16)	(77)
Maplewood	353	280	40	33
		(79)	(11)	(10)
Mathews	257	31	69	157
		(12)	(27)	(61)
Menchaca	381	12	42	327
		(3)	(11)	(86)
Metz	495	4	487	4
		(1)	(98)	(1)
Norman	316	309	7	—
		(98)	(2)	

School	*Total*	*Black*	*Mexican-American*	*Anglo*
Oak Hill	582	3	18	561
		(1)	(3)	(96)
Oak Springs	321	303	18	—
		(94)	(6)	
Odom	1032	25	240	767
		(3)	(23)	(74)
Ortega	399	243	145	11
		(61)	(36)	(3)
Palm	419	—	394	25
			(94)	(6)
Pease	254	47	53	154
		(18)	(21)	(61)
Pecan Springs	537	205	53	279
		(38)	(10)	(52)
Pillow	538	8	30	500
		(1)	(6)	(93)
Pleasant Hill	821	22	172	627
		(3)	(21)	(76)
Read	681	70	37	574
		(10)	(6)	(84)
Reilly	278	4	78	196
		(1)	(28)	(71)
Ridgetop	228	2	111	115
		(1)	(49)	(50)
Rosedale	266	7	52	207
		(3)	(19)	(78)
Rosewood	160	156	4	—
		(98)	(2)	
St. Elmo	975	32	321	622
		(3)	(33)	(64)
Sims	494	455	34	5
		(92)	(7)	(1)
Summitt	201	—	1	200
				(100)

School	*Total*	*Black*	*Mexican-American*	*Anglo*
Sunset Valley	611	20	61	530
		(3)	(10)	(87)
Travis Heights	762	93	301	368
		(12)	(40)	(48)
Walnut Creek	308	3	42	263
		(1)	(14)	(85)
Webb	897	169	122	606
		(19)	(14)	(67)
Winn	544	180	34	330
		(33)	(6)	(61)
Wooldridge	747	32	80	635
		(4)	(11)	(85)
Wooten	635	18	85	532
		(3)	(13)	(84)
Zavala	415	23	384	8
		(6)	(92)	(2)
Zilker	541	23	100	418
		(4)	(19)	(77)
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS TOTALS	30,567	4989	7242	18,336
		(16)	(24)	(60)
GRAND TOTAL	58,920	9110	13,266	36,544
		(15)	(23)	(62)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	( )	
	( )	
	( )	**Civil**
	( )	**Action**
VS.	( )	**No. A-**
	( )	**70-CA-80**
	( )	
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY, ET AL.	( )	
(Austin Independent School Dist.)	( )	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This school desegregation suit is before this Court on remand from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, 467 F.2d 848 (1972). The suit was originally brought by the United States Department of Justice to challenge alleged segregation of black and Mexican-American students in the Austin Independent School District (AISD). On July 19, 1971, this Court approved, with modifications, a school desegregation plan proposed by the AISD. On appeal, the Circuit Court, aware of the equivocation by the Department of Justice, permitted intervention by interested black and Mexican-American citizens of Austin. The Justice Department's equivocation has been manifested by an unwillingness, continuing to this day, to submit a plan which it would consider appropriate to remedy the segregation it

alleges to exist in the AISD. This Court is now once again in the position of being compelled to pass upon the adequacy of a student assignment plan submitted by the AISD. The Court having heard all evidence, testimony, stipulations and argument presented by the parties, now sets forth its Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in this Memorandum Opinion and Order.

I. DISCRIMINATION AS TO BLACKS

Prior to Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) the AISD was required by State law to segregate black and white students. Shortly after the Supreme Court's declaration that the operation of such a dual school system contravened the Constitution, the AISD began a voluntary program of desegregation until by 1963, enforced segregation was completely removed from the school system. While the District's efforts during that time undoubtedly fell short of the subsequently-proclaimed "affirmative duty to take whatever steps might be necessary to convert to a unitary system in which discrimination would be eliminated root and branch," Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, 391 U.S. 430, 437-38 (1968), its voluntary actions during a time when many Southern communities were violently rejecting any desegregation whatsoever reflects a desire to comply with the law and to eschew discriminatory segregation.

Nonetheless, the fact is clear that the AISD, at some time in the past, has engaged in discriminatory assignment of black students to promote segregation. As the Supreme Court has said, "If the actions of school authorities were

to any degree motivated by segregative intent and the segregation resulting from those actions continues to exist, the fact of remoteness in time certainly does not make those actions any less 'intentional'." Keyes v. School District No. 1, _____U.S._____, 41 U.S.L.W. 5002, 5008 (June 19, 1973). Consequently, the AISD must now show that it has dismantled its old dual school system, and converted to an integrated unitary school system.

II. DISCRIMINATION AS TO MEXICAN-AMERICANS

Indisputably, some eight elementary, two junior high, and one senior high schools in Austin educate disproportionately large numbers of Mexican-American students. The Fourteenth Amendment, of course, prohibits segregation in public schools if it results from state action. As the Fifth Circuit has noted, two distinct factual determinations are required to support a finding of unlawful segregation: "First, a denial of equal educational opportunity . . ., defined as racial or ethnic segregation. Secondly, this segregation must be the result of state action." Cisneros v. Corpus Christi Independent School District, 467 F.2d 142, 148 (5th Cir. 1972).

Inasmuch as the AISD has, in the past, maintained a dual school system insofar as black students are concerned, we must first determine whether this policy was "separate, identifiable and unrelated," Keyes, supra at 5009, to the District's treatment of Mexican-American students. Clearly it was. The AISD's old statutorily required dual school system was based upon discrimination

between whites and blacks. Mexican-American students are, and always have been, classified as "white" by the AISD. The historic legal treatment of black and Mexican-American students has been completely different. Moreover, the treatment of Mexican-American students was wholly unrelated to maintenance of the black-white dual school system.

The School District having demonstrated that the black-white dual system did not create a dual school system insofar as Mexican-American's were concerned, we must consider whether the AISD has rebutted ". . . petitioners' prima facie case of intentional segregation [of Mexican-American's] . . . raised by the finding of intentional segregation [of blacks] . . ." Keyes, supra at 5009.

> There, the Board's burden is to show that its policies and practices with respect to school site locations, school size, school renovations and additions, student attendance zones, student assignment and transfer options, mobile classroom units, transportation of students, assignment of faculty and staff, etc., considered together and premised on the Board's so-called "neighborhood school" concept, either were not taken in effectuation of a policy to create or maintain segregation [of Mexican-American's] . . ., or, if unsuccessful in that effort, were not factors in causing the existing condition of segregation in these schools.

Id.

We begin by observing that there has never been any statute, rule, regulation, or policy of the AISD which prohibited Mexican-American students from attending school

with Anglo students. Mexican-American and Anglo students have attended schools and classes together at virtually all times during the operation of the AISD. Notwithstanding this uncontroverted fact, we must determine whether the AISD has ever exhibited a purpose or intent to promote segregation of Mexican-American students. "We emphasize that the differentiating factor between *de jure* segregation and so-called *de facto* segregation to which we referred in Swann [v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg, 402 U.S. 1 (1971).] is *purpose* or *intent* to segregate." Keyes, supra at 5007

Perhaps the strongest showing of an allegedly segregative intent toward Mexican-American's is in the creation of the West Avenue, Comal Street and Zavala schools. West Avenue served grades 1-3 from 1916 until 1947. Comal Street was closed in 1936. Zavala operated as a special school from 1936 until 1954, when it was given an attendance zone similar to any other school. These schools were designed to serve the educational needs of non-English speaking students, and students who were members of migrant farm-working families and who could not, consequently, attend school for a full normal school year. In this day of educational innovation, the Court notes that many of the teaching methods used in these schools may now be considered outdated and inadequate. Nonetheless, the Court is of the strong opinion that the existence of these schools represented no more than a humane and compassionate attempt by the School District, using the educational techniques then accepted as proper and progressive, to meet the special educational needs of children who would otherwise have been much more severely handicapped in their efforts to obtain an education. More-

over, Mexican-American students were not required to attend these special schools. On the contrary, substantial numbers of Mexican-American students attended other predominantly Anglo schools throughout the District during this time. The Court finds that these three schools, all of which were open schools with no attendance zones while operating as special schools, had no effect on the racial or ethnic housing patterns in the District.

Of the seven predominantly Mexican-American elementary schools in the District other than Zavala, five (Becker, Palm, Metz, Dawson and Govalle) opened as predominantly Anglo schools. These five schools gradually became predominantly Mexican-American because of shifting residential patterns, and their transformation was in no way caused by any action of the AISD. The District has clearly shown the lack of a segregatory intent or purpose regarding these schools.

The other five predominantly Mexican-American schools in the District (Allison and Brooke Elementary, Martin and Allan Jr. High, and Johnston High Schools) did open with a predominance of Mexican-American students. The record reflects however, that these schools were, without exception, located as they were solely because of growth in the East Austin area and the need for new schools to serve the area. The area of heaviest black and Mexican-American concentration in the District, referred to herein as East Austin, is a relatively isolated area. It is bounded on the south by the Colorado River, across which access is inadequate. To the west of the area are a major interstate highway, the University of Texas, and the State Capitol complex. Barricading the north end of the area is the Austin Municipal Airport. On the eastern edge

of the area is the AISD boundary. Thus, schools built to serve growth in East Austin could necessarily serve *only* that area unless the historically-honored "neighborhood school" concept were completely abandoned. The location of schools within this area had little immediate impact, and virtually no long-term impact, upon the integration of Anglo and Mexican-American students.

After a thorough review of the evidence the Court finds that the AISD has successfully demonstrated that its policies with regard to school site location, school size, school renovations and additions, student attendance zones, student assignment and transfer options, mobile classroom units, transportation of students, assignment of faculty and staff, etc., were not effectuated as part of a policy of promoting segregation of Mexican-American's. Rather, the Court finds that the AISD has demonstrated an absence of segregatory intent or purpose toward Mexican-American's. Consequently, a decree by this Court for "all-out desegregation" of Mexican-American's would be improper. Keyes, supra at 5009.

Our obligation to assure to the Mexican-American intervenors in this case the equal protection of the laws does not end with our finding that such segregation of Mexican-American's as does exist in Austin is not the result of a segregatory intent or purpose on the part of the AISD. Mexican-American's in Austin constitute an identifiable ethnic minority, recognizable by their numbers, concentration, cultural uniqueness, and common special needs and problems. We find that Mexican-American students in Austin constitute "an identifiable, ethnic-minority class entitled to the equal protection guarantee of the Fourteenth Amendment." Cisneros, supra at 149. As such,

Mexican-American students are entitled to proper implementation of steps necessary to assure them the equal protection of the laws and an equal educational opportunity, including implementation of a curriculum and special educational programs, such as bilingual-bicultural education, necessary to provide equal educational opportunities for Mexican-American students as a group.

III. THE REMEDY

The AISD has submitted a compilation of its record in converting to a unitary school system and fulfilling its obligation to implement a curriculum and special educational programs necessary to provide equal educational opportunities for black and Mexican-American students. Additionally, it has submitted a "Sixth Grade Center Plan" and an alternative "Fifth and Sixth Grade Center Plan" by which the mixing of black and white students will be promoted.

Austin junior and senior high school students are fully desegregated. The closing of the old Anderson High School and Kealing Junior High School has been challenged by the black Intervenors. Testimony indicated, however, that the old Anderson (the Anderson name has been retained and transferred to the new high school due to open for the 1973-74 school year, serving the predominantly Anglo northwest area of Austin; this action will make Austin one of the comparatively few cities in Texas to have a predominantly Anglo high school named in honor of a black person) facility was inadequate to continue as a high school. One option would have been to

convert it to a junior high school. The AISD has now, however, designated the facility as a location for the newly-created community college in Austin. As such, the facility will draw students from throughout the District. We find this use of the facility to be fully as acceptable as any other possible use. Testimony further indicated that only a part of the Kealing facility would be acceptable for continued use. Rather than operate on this basis, the District determined that the facility should be closed and its students re-assigned. We find no impermissible closing of schools solely for racial reasons. Cf. Lee v. Macon County Board of Education, 448 F.2d 746 (5th Cir. 1971). Moreover, the impact of the closing of these facilities will be greatly alleviated with the opening of the new Lyndon B. Johnson (Northeast) High School in 1974, and the projected construction of a new Northeast Junior High School. These facilities will be placed in racially neutral locations, drawing naturally desegregated student bodies.

The desegregation of elementary schools presents the greatest problem in this case. Elementary zones have traditionally been small in Austin, and the facilities, drawing students only from their immediate neighborhoods, have been correspondingly small. As we have previously discussed, East Austin is a locked-in, relatively inaccessible part of Austin. The only portion of Austin readily accessible from East Austin is Northeast Austin. The schools in Northeast Austin are, however, already largely integrated, and any attempt to use this area alone as the AISD's desegregative tool would be inequitable, would upset natural patterns of integration, and would very likely result ultimately in total resegregation.

Additionally, the predominantly Mexican-American Southeast Austin area could be used to desegregate black

schools. This would, however, be intolerable. As this Court has stated, "All too often, the practical effect of the 'desegregation' of school systems has been that black students are mixed with Mexican-American students, thus denying to both groups the benefit of any meaningful desegregation. Schools with substantial Mexican-American populations cannot be made to carry a disproportionate share of the burden of desegregation." Arvizu v. Waco Independent School District, at 8, Civil Action No. W-71-CA-56 (W.D. Tex. April 27, 1973).

Clearly, the entire community must be involved in any effort to desegregate the black East Austin elementary schools. The Sixth Grade Center Plan submitted by the AISD does involve the entire community in the desegregation of at least one grade of the elementary school years. Involvement of the entire community in desegregation of additional grades (even the District's Fifth and Sixth Grade Center Plan does not involve all students in the District in both grades) would involve progressively massive transportation, the uprooting of children in their earliest formative years, and would be educationally dysfunctional. Considering the "age of the children, and the risk to health and probable impingement of the educational process," United States v. Texas Education Agency (Austin Independent School District), 467 F.2d 848, 885 (5th Cir. 1972) (Bell, J., specially concurring), we find that the time required for transportation, risk to health, and probable impingement of education for students younger than the sixth grade would be prohibitive under any such plan.

In assessing the AISD's proposal, we note the language of Mr. Justice Powell:

The term "integrated school systems" presupposes, of course, a total absence of any laws, regulations of policies supportive of the type of "legalized" segregation condemned in Brown. A system would be integrated in accord with constitutional standards if the responsible authorities had taken appropriate steps to (i) integrate faculties and administration; (ii) scrupulously assure equality of facilities, instruction and curricula opportunities throughout the district; (iii) utilize their authority to draw attendance zones to promote integration; (iv) locate new schools, close old ones, and determine the size and grade categories with the same objective in mind. Where school authorities decide to undertake the transportation of students, this also must be with integrative opportunities in mind.

> . . . An integrated school system does not mean—and indeed could not mean in view of the residential patterns of most of our major metropolitan areas—that *every school* must in fact be an integrated unit. A school which happens to be all or predominantly white or all or predominantly black is not a "segregated" school in an unconstitutional sense if the system itself is a genuinely integrated one.

Keyes, supra at 5012 (Powell, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part). We note that in addition to its submitted Sixth Grade Center Plan the AISD has taken other steps to effect its conversion to a unitary integrated system, including: (i) A commitment to employ a black and a Mexican-American assistant superintendent to work at the cabinet level with system-wide responsibilities and to provide special assistance in the development of programs and activities for black and Mexican-American students; (ii) Establishment of majority-to-minority transfer provisions

for both black and Mexican-American students, with free transportation provided; (iii) A commitment to employ five elementary assistant directors who will, *inter alia*, supervise and evaluate programs; (iv) Implementation of many innovative programs designed to aid minority students, including bilingual-bicultural educational programs; (v) Alteration of existing school attendance zones and the drawing of attendance zones for new schools to promote desegregation; and (vi) Construction and projection of new schools to be located in such a manner as to maximize integration.

Thus, although the Sixth Grade Center Plan contemplates the continued operation of several predominantly black schools, we find that it, combined with the District's other efforts and commitments, will render the AISD to be a unitary and integrated school system. In approving the Plan, however, we wish to emphasize that all its components are a legal obligation of the District. The District's commitments—to integrate the administration, to maintain an integrated faculty and continue to seek qualified Mexican-American teachers, to assign faculty members to schools in a nondiscriminatory manner (we construe this to mean that teachers in predominantly minority schools shall be equivalent to teachers in predominantly Anglo schools according to such objective criteria as experience and educational background), to scrupulously assure equality of facilities, to assure equality of educational opportunities through programs especially designed to meet the needs of black and Mexican-American students, to utilize its authority to draw attendance zones to promote integration, and to locate new schools, close old ones, and determine the size and grade categories to promote inte-

gration—are all legal obligations which shall be strictly enforced by the Court. Likewise, the District must afford Mexican-American's protection against bearing a disproportionate burden of desegregation of black students, and must promote rather than retard tri-ethnic integration as part of its legal obligation.

This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this cause, and the School District is directed to report to the Court semi-annually, on or about January 15, and July 15, of each year, regarding the status of integration in the AISD. Included in these reports shall be: the status of faculty and administration integration; the comparative objective qualifications of teachers in predominantly minority schools *vis-a-vis* the objective qualifications of teachers of that grade level in the District as a whole; the addition or elimination of any programs especially designed to meet the educational needs of black and Mexican-American students; the status of efforts to draw school attendance zones and locate new schools to promote integration; the status of the District's commitment to scrupulously assure equality of facilities; a report regarding utilization of the District's majority-to-minority transfer plan; and the status of student integration in each school in the District. Additionally, this Court shall require that prior to any change in school attendance zones and prior to construction of any new school by the District, the Board shall notify counsel for Plaintiff and Intervenors of such proposal. If, within thirty (30) days, counsel for Plaintiff and Intervenors have made no objection thereto, the proposal shall be considered approved by the Court. If, within thirty (30) days, objection is made, the Court shall hear and resolve the dispute by approving or disapproving the proposal. It is accordingly

ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the Sixth Grade Center Plan submitted by the Austin Independent School District be, and hereby is, APPROVED, under the terms and conditions set out herein. We attach hereto, and incorporate herein, a copy of the Plan. This Memorandum Opinion and Order shall constitute Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

Entered at Austin, Texas, this 1st day of August, 1973.

_____

United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	( )	
	( )	
	( )	
	( )	**Civil**
VS.	( )	**Action**
	( )	**No. A-**
	( )	**70-CA-80**
	( )	
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY, ET AL.	( )	
(Austin Ind. School District)	( )	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

On June 28, 1971, this Court entered an Order determining the absence of *de jure* segregation against Mexican Americans, but the continuation of the vestiges of a dual school system as regards Blacks. This Order incorporates that earlier Memorandum Opinion and Order and proceeds to outline a plan for eliminating the dual school system.

Despite this Court's repeated requests for a joint plan, the parties were able to agree only as to the high school integration plan submitted by the Austin Independent School District. *See* Report and Submission filed July 15, 1971. As regards junior highs, the Plaintiff continued to disregard this Court's guideline three as to the unsuitabili-

ty of Anderson for a junior or senior high facility. The previously determined unsuitability of the Anderson facility, the greater costs, and longer transportation time involved in the Plaintiff's plan require this Court to reject it. *See* Defendant's Exhibits 37 and 82.

In reviewing the plans submitted for elementary school integration, this Court first reiterates its guideline calling for minimized busing. The testimony at the earlier hearing of this case convinced this Court that extensive crosstown busing could only harm the local education system. Dr. Cecil Hardesty, Superintendent of Schools in Jacksonville, Florida, an unbiased educational expert who has had extensive experience with crosstown busing ordered in his school district, delineated the many adverse effects from this remedial technique. The added time requirements imposed on students by busing often reduce attendance and produce higher dropout rates, especially among minority students, and limit the opportunity of all transported students to participate before and after school in extracurricular activities, which both parties agree are an important factor in the educational process. Busing similarly reduces parental participation in school activities, particularly where it necessitates dividing a family's children among a number of schools. It also taxes the capability of health facilities in individual schools to deal with at-school injuries and illnesses. Of course, the objections to busing thus far enumerated might in many circumstances apply with equal validity to the traditional role bus transportation has played in overcoming the geographical separation between pupil and school. However, such objections take on a new and much larger dimension in the urban environment where massive transportation of students is involved.

Moreover, both Dr. Hardesty and Dr. Davidson further testified that busing students simply to achieve racial balance, as opposed to the traditional function of bus transportation, raises new educational problems not heretofore experienced. Transportation of students, particularly the very young, from their home neighborhoods into strange and often hostile environments causes raised anxiety levels in both students and their teachers that constitute psychological barriers to learning progress, and subjects students to traumatic experiences that they are not equipped by age or experience to handle. The Court is also aware of other barriers posed by community opposition to forced busing. Cf. United States v. Haynes, _____F.2d_____ No. 71-1165 (5th Cir. June 17, 1971). Because such large numbers of students must be transported within a reasonably short period of time, busing to achieve desegregation in Austin will necessitate assembly of students at their neighborhood schools prior to transporting them to another school. Thus inclement weather may pose problems in sheltering up to twice the school's student capacity during the busing period in the morning and afternoon. Moreover, in Austin, the bus routes would require transporting many students through a heavy traffic complex consisting of downtown Austin (Colorado River to 11th Street), the Capitol complex (12th Street to 19th Street) and the University of Texas campus (19th Street to approximately 27th Street). The traffic situation is further complicated by the fact that Interstate Highway 35, which is the main north-south traffic artery in Austin, is undergoing major construction work involving the closing of traffic lanes and various detours. This Court therefore finds that the traffic situation presents a serious and

substantial obstacle to the safe transportation of school children. Finally, it should be noted that transportation costs in excess of those normally incurred in the traditional function of busing are essentially a non-productive expenditure, since such costs contribute little, if anything to academic achievement. Dollars spent on additional buses, driver's salaries, gasoline, tires and other maintenance yield little or no educational return to the community; dollars spent on productive programs, teacher's salaries, books, facilities and teaching equipment do.

Accordingly, this Court finds as a fact that busing to achieve desegregation in the Austin community will result in serious interference with the educational process. Because of this, the Court has examined both the HEW Recommendations and the AISD plan with a view toward minimizing busing and maximizing the use of neighborhood schools. Normally, in fashioning a remedy, the recommendations of the Department of Health, Education & Welfare are entitled to great weight, U.S. v. Jefferson County Board of Education, 372 F.2d 836, 847 (5th Cir. 1966), and "the school districts are to bear the burden of demonstrating beyond question, after a hearing, the unworkability of the [HEW] proposals . . . ." Carter v. West Feliciana Parish School Bd., 396 U.S. 290, 292 (1969) (concurring opinion of Justice Harlan.) In the instant case, however, the evidence adduced at trial, especially the uncontradicted testimony of Mr. Cunningham and Dr. Davidson, shows that despite AISD's repeated attempts to communicate with HEW, over a period of several months, nothing was forthcoming from HEW until approximately 30 days prior to trial. At this time, HEW filed with this Court its comments on the desegregation

plan formulated by the AISD. These comments (Letter from Thomas Kendrick, Senior Program Officer to Dr. Jack Davidson, Superintendent, AISD, dated and filed May 14, 1971) [Hereinafter called HEW Recommendations] as they have been amended at trial through the introduction of Plaintiff's Exhibits 23, 25 and 26, and the Report and Submission filed with this Court on July 15, 1971, constitute the only documentary evidence of any desegregation plan developed by HEW. At trial, several further modifications to the HEW Recommendations were revealed for the first time through the oral testimony of Mr. A. T. Miller, the HEW Project Officer. The only explanation offered by HEW for this course of conduct was the testimony of Mr. Miller that he was not authorized to deviate from the HEW plan, which had been drawn in Washington, D.C., but that he had been "available" for consultation throughout the pendency of the suit. The fact remains, however, that the AISD was not given the benefit of HEW recommendations in drawing its plan, despite repeated efforts to obtain such recommendations, until approximately 30 days prior to trial. This inflexibility on the part of HEW is inconsistent with this Court's understanding of the role to be played by HEW in the complex, difficult task of urban school desegregation, and it is further inconsistent with the clear and obvious purpose of this Court's Order of September 4, 1970, directing the parties to attempt agreement on a common desegregation plan. This case thus appears to depart substantially from the usual run of school cases in that here the uncommunicative, uncooperative and recalcitrant party has been not the local school board, but the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

This Court has therefore weighed both plans according to their relative merits under the two-pronged test developed in the cases:

(1) Does the plan convert *now* the existing dual school system "to a unitary system in which racial discrimination would be eliminated root and branch?" Green v. County School Board, 391 U.S. 430, 437-38 (1969), and

(2) Is the plan "reasonable, realistic and workable?", Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, supra, at 575.

HIGH SCHOOLS

The parties have agreed that the plan submitted by AISD for implementation in the Fall of 1971 (see Defendants' Exhibits Nos. 35 and 37) would assign all black high school students to schools that are not identifiable as Negro schools, (Report and Submission of July 15, 1971, at I), and the Court so finds. The AISD plan for the high schools, (Alternate Plan No. 2, for the 1971-72 school year) together with the planned construction of three new high schools and proposed revision of attendance zones, (Alternate Plan No. I, for the 1973-74 school year) meets all constitutional requirements and is therefore APPROVED.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

The parties similarly agree that the AISD plan for junior high schools, (Defendants' Exhibit No. 36, Alternate Plan

No. 2, as modified by the closing of Kealing Jr. High School for the 1971-72 school year) would assign all black junior high school students to schools that are not identifiable as Negro schools, although HEW expresses doubt that this would comply with the fourth guideline contained in this Court's Memorandum Opinion and Order of June 28, 1971, since it, together with AISD's high school plan "unnecessarily places on the black community the entire burden of desegregating on the secondary level." Report and Submission of July 15, 1971, at 2-3. The guideline in question was addressed to any attempt on the part of either party to achieve desegregation merely by integrating blacks with Mexican-Americans as opposed to integrating them throughout the entire community. Although some of the same considerations of fairness support HEW's position, this Court believes that they are outweighed by the continuity of zone lines and feeder patterns, decreased likelihood of "white flight", transportation efficiencies and coordination with the AISD elementary plan afforded by the AISD junior high plan. Moreover, the HEW proposals for secondary schools disregard an additional cost of some $246,200. for portable buildings made necessary by the crowding of some facilities and drastic underutilization of others under the HEW plan, and involves the use of Anderson High School as a junior high facility, which this Court finds unsatisfactory. The AISD junior high school plan (Alternate Plan No. 2), as modified by the closing of Kealing Jr. High, also meets all constitutional requirements and is APPROVED.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Austin's 55 elementary schools, which are widely scattered across the city to meet neighborhood needs, pose the major problem in implementing an effective desegregation program. HEW suggests pairing for a few contiguous attendance zones, but in the main recommends the groups of contiguous zones be "clustered" with "satellite" or noncontiguous zones. *See* HEW Recommendations at 3-5 and Attachment 1, and Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Each cluster, usually consisting of one predominately Black school, one predominately Mexican-American school, and four predominately Anglo schools, would be thoroughly integrated on a daily basis through extensive cross-town busing. Mr. Miller, the HEW Project Officer, indicated that in each cluster all students in one of the schools, or several grades could be divided among several of the schools in the cluster. In the Report and Submission of July 15, 1971, HEW further suggests "full time pairing of the five all-black elementary schools (counting Rosewood and Oak Springs as one school encompassing grades one through six) with ten or more non-contiguous Anglo schools."

While employing a form of clustering similar to that proposed by HEW at trial, (*See* Defendant's Exhibit 78 at 16) AISD offers a unique new approach to elementary desegregation. Integrating not only people, but the entire educational process, the AISD plan creates learning resource centers, provides inter-school visitations, and sponsors joint field study trips. A "Companion School Team Planning Advisory Council", composed of representatives from each school in a given cluster as well as

staff representatives, would develop integrated educational programs for the cluster. As explained more fully in Defendant's Exhibit 80,

> [t]he primary purpose of the multi-cultural learning activities at the Learning Resource Centers is to provide new dimensions of understanding by placing greater emphasis on the cultural influences and contributions of various ethnic groups of American society.

To accomplish this objective, one center each for fine arts, social sciences, avocations, and science, would be established in vacant or underutilized facilities designated by AISD. According to Defendant's Exhibit 78, "Major Program Thrusts" would be "1. Bolster academic programs in one race schools (cognitive learning) [and] 2. Develop wholesome attitudes and understandings (affective learning)." As "a major portion of the social studies curriculum", these centers will concentrate on "instructional groups" "composed of "four multi-ethnic student teams consisting of 6, 7, or 8 students each, depending on the size of the companion school group." Defendant's Exhibit 80. These instructional groups would regularly be assembled for inter-school visits, field study trips, and planned programs at the learning resource centers. The bus transportation used both to assemble the groups and transport them to these activities would be integrated into the educational program through the use of supervised on-bus activities.

Under the AISD plan the Court finds that elementary students would be in a desegregated environment as much as twenty-five (25) percent of the school year. This Court

further finds that the AISD elementary plan, particularly in its creation of learning resource centers, possesses great educational benefits. It is a program designed specifically to develop in elementary school children the capacity to understand, appreciate and respect cultural values other than their own by providing, in a structured, supervised program, a common bond of experience with members of other ethnic groups. The central thrust of the AISD plan is to eliminate the mutual fears that lie at the heart of racial prejudice, and the discriminatory attitudes that flow from such fears, through educational activities specifically tailored to reach this objective. Its underlying premise is that meaningful and effective desegregation depends primarily on the quality, and only secondarily on the quantity, of the multicultural experiences to which each elementary school child is exposed.

HEW attempts to stigmatize this innovative proposal with the label "part-time desegregation", relying on *Bivins v. Bibb County Board of Education*, 424 F.2d 97,98 (5th Civ. 1970) where only 25% of the Negro students were attending formerly all-white schools and only "nine percent of the white students were participating or waiting to participate on a part-time basis in virtually all of the all-Negro schools in response to the incentive of special courses there . . . ." No such scheme is proposed by the AISD elementary plan, which is mandatory on all elementary students and which encompasses virtually all of the system's Anglo elementary students for a much larger portion of their academic time in a far wider and more meaningful range of multicultural experiences. This Court therefore considers *Bivins v. Bibb County, supra,* inapplicable to this case.

Nor can the HEW Recommendations be said to provide more satisfactory distribution of ethnic groups. Plaintiff's Cluster #5, when examined in view of the more accurate enrollment figures provided in Defendant's Exhibit 79, includes only eighteen Blacks or about 1% of the cluster's student population; Cluster #6 includes only twenty-one Blacks or about 2%. *See* HEW Recommendations, Attach. E for composition of clusters. At the same time HEW would pair three schools—Becker, Mathews, and Pease—which, as indicated in Defendant's Exhibit 79, are already integrated on a tri-ethnic basis.

While the HEW Recommendations strictly avoid any discussion of implementation methods, which, of course, form the core of any determination as to reasonableness and workability, Mr. Miller's testimony indicates almost total reliance upon extended daily busing of 89% elementary students. *See* Plaintiff's Exhibit 26. This Court finds as a matter of fact that this proposal entails all the educational disadvantages of busing previously discussed. Moreover, the cost comparison of the HEW proposal with that of AISD is startling. Because the AISD can employ during the school day at the elementary level the same buses used to transport secondary students, no additional equipment is required. Consequently, expenditures would be held to $100,000. in operating costs. Defendant's Exhibit 82. In this same exhibit, the AISD estimates that the HEW elementary proposal would cost $1,708,000.—$1,573,000. for transportation, and $135,000. for additional portable rooms. Even the Plaintiff's Exhibit 26, with its understatement of the number of buses required to implement the HEW Recommendations estimates total first year costs of $717,900. This Court finds as a matter

of fact that, by either estimate, the cost of this proposal places an unreasonable burden upon the school district. This Court further finds that the minimum number of buses necessary to implement the HEW proposals cannot be obtained until late in the 1971-72 school year. See direct testimony of Dr. Leon R. Graham.

After a review of the evidence, particularly Defendant's Exhibit 82, Attach. A, this Court finds that the AISD plan is preferable also because it imposes lesser time burdens on students in going to and from school and lessens traffic hazards. Unlike the HEW Recommendations, the limited amount of busing required by the AISD will occur during hours of lessened traffic flow, as a part of the learning day with teacher participation. This Court finds that the AISD plan minimizes the disadvantages inherent in busing.

The AISD elementary plan is a wholly new approach to the problems of desegregating elementary schools locked deeply in areas of urban minority concentration. Under difficult circumstances, the plan achieves maximum desegregation consistent with reasonable cost, student safety and educational soundness. It is the finding of this Court that Defendants have met their burden of showing the non-feasibility of the HEW proposals, and that the AISD elementary plan is the only physically possible desegregation plan for the 1971-72 school year because of the non-availability of additional buses until late in the second semester.

With the closing of St. John's Elementary School, a predominantly black school, the students of which can easily be assigned to neighboring schools, and the addition of a majority-to-minority transfer provision, the AISD elementary plan will also meet all constitutional requirements.

CONCLUSION

Upon implementation of the AISD plans for the high schools, junior high schools and elementary schools, as modified herein, the defendant school district will be in full compliance with the previous Orders of this Court dated September 4, 1970, December 15, 1970, February 26, 1971, and April 14, 1971, all terms of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the constitutional principles announced in Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), Green v. County School Board, 391 U.S. 430 (1968), and Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, _____ U.S. _____, 28 L.Ed.2d 554 (1971), and will have achieved a unitary school system. This memorandum Opinion shall constitute this Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law pursuant to Rule 52, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

ORDER

Based upon the foregoing memorandum Opinion, it is ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that"

1. Alternate Plan No. 2, proposed by the Austin School Board, is to be put into immediate effect subject to the following modifications:

a. Kealing Junior High School is to be closed for school year of 1971-72.

b. St. Johns Elementary School is to be closed and its students reassigned to the neighboring white schools.

c. Paragraphs B, C, F and G of the interim Desegregation Plan for the Austin Independent School District

implemented by this Court's Order of September 4, 1970, shall remain in effect.

2. The site locations for the proposed high schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools are hereby approved; the School Board is further ORDERED to report back to this Court on June 1, 1972, and every six (6) months thereafter, on the site acquisition, progress, planning and construction of new schools.

3. Since the AISD plan for elementary desegregation is unique in approach, the Board will report to this Court on October 1, 1971, and each February 1, and June 1, of succeeding years the progress made in desegregation at all levels with special emphasis on information pertinent to the elementary program, such reports to include, but not be limited to, student involvement, racial composition of staff and students, participation in extracurricular activities, and transportation utilized to accomplish both Board Alternate Plan No. 2 and the AISD plan for elementary schools.

4. Prior to the occupation of the new high schools and junior high schools at Northeast High School, Northwest High School, Austin High School, Rundberg Lane Junior High School, Northeast Junior High School, and the South First Street Junior High School, the Board will submit to this Court a projected ethnic composition for each school so that this Court can determine whether the features of Alternate Plan No. 2 should be continued or altered.

5. As authorized by the Supreme Court in *Swan v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, supra,* this Court will retain jurisdiction of this case to insure that the unitary system hereinabove provided and required is oper-

ated in accordance with these Orders to achieve the objective specified. For this purpose, it is required that the Austin School Board shall, on or before the 1st day of the months of November, December, February, March, April and May, during the 1971-72 school year, submit to this court reports each of which shall cover the following topics:

a. Students, including (1) the number of students by race enrolled in the school district; (2) the number of students by race enrolled in each school in the district; (3) the number of students by race enrolled in each classroom in each of the schools in the district; and (4) the number of school days during each month that each child has participated in multi-cultural activities pursuant to the elementary school program, broken down by learning resource center visits, inter-site visits, and field-study trips.

b. Teachers, including (1) the number of full-time teachers by race in the district; (2) the number of full-time teachers by race in each school in the district; (3) the number of part-time teachers by race in the district; and (4) the number of part-time teachers by race in each school in the district.

c. Transfers, describing the requests and results which have accrued by race, under the majority-to-minority transfer provision which is a part of this Court's Order.

d. Specifying any change which may have been made in the boundaries of any zone or zones.

e. Transportation system, including the number of vehicles in use and the extent to which black and white students are transported daily on the same buses.

f. Utilization of equipment, including a statement that all gymnasia, auditoriums, cafeterias and like facilities are being operated on an integrated basis.

6. If it appears that the plan hereby adopted does not in actual fact and in operation provide the unitary system for which it was designed and adopted, the Order of this Court may be changed to whatever extent necessary to accomplish the objective.

SIGNED at Austin, Texas, this _____ day of July, 1971.

_____

United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	( )	
	( )	
	( )	**Civil**
	( )	**Action**
VS.	( )	**No. A-**
	( )	**70-CA-80**
	( )	
	( )	
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY, ET AL.	( )	
(Austin Ind. School District)	( )	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

On August 7, 1970, the Attorney General of the United States, on behalf of the United States, initiated this action against the Texas Education Agency, the State Commissioner of Education, and seven school districts. This Opinion constitutes Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law concerning those allegations against Defendant Austin Independent School District [hereinafter referred to as AISD].

Plaintiff alleges that AISD, contrary to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §2000c-6(a) and (b) and the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, "has traditionally operated and continues to operate a dual school system based on race." In addition, Plaintiff

contends that AISD is "discriminating against Mexican-American students by assigning Mexican-American students to schools on the basis of their ethnic origin . . . . [and by] maintaining schools that are identifiable as Mexican-American schools, and schools that are attended almost exclusively by Mexican-American and Negro students."

On August 27, 1970, this Court held a hearing concerning the AISD and entered an oral Order implementing the Interim Desegregation Plan formulated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. After the modification of this Order on September 4, 1970, the parties were given until December 15, 1970, to submit a common plan providing for the complete desegregation of the AISD. Despite four further Orders of this Court extending this deadline, cooperation between the parties was most limited and no common plan was produced.

On May 14, 1971, Plaintiff and Defendant submitted their separate desegregation plans. Consideration of these

---

[1]The Swann decision has been considered in other stages of litigation. Gaines v. Dougherty County Bd. of Education, _____F.2d_____, No. 30290 (5th Cir. June 7, 1971) (remanding student assignment plan); Davis v. School Dist. of the City of Pontiac, Inc., _____F.2d_____, No. 20477 (6th Cir. May 28, 1971) (affirming a district court desegregation plan); Johnson v. San Francisco United School Dist., _____ F.Supp. _____, No. C-70 1331 SAW (N.D. Cal. April 28, 1971) (requiring parties to file desegregation plan); Ross v. Eckels, _____F.Supp._____, No. 10444 (S.D. Tex. May 24, 1971) (denying motions to amend and to intervene).

For an excellent analysis of Swann and earlier desegregation rulings see Comment, *Busing, Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg and the future of Desegregation in the Fifth Circuit*, 49 TEX.L.REV. _____1971.

plans resulted in a full scale desegregation trial.

AISD is currently composed of 54,970 students of whom 64.6% are Anglo; 20.4%, Mexican American; and 15.1%, Black. Plaintiff's Exhibit 59, at 11. These demographic data raise an initial question posed to the Court—the effect of a large ethnic minority group other than Blacks upon efforts to dismantle a dual school system. That Mexican Americans constitute a separate ethnic group has been recognized by several earlier decisions,[2] by this Court in its appointment of a *Tri-Ethnic* as distinguished from a *Bi-Racial* Advisory Committee,[3] by the testimony of AISD Superintendent, Dr. Jack Davidson, and by even the most casual examination of Mexican American culture. But the mere existence of an ethnic group, regardless of its racial origin, and standing alone, does not establish a case for integrating it with the remainder of the school population. Rather the Plaintiff must show that there has been some form of *de jure* segregation against the ethnic minority. In considering the Defendant's actions, this Court adopts the broad standard expressed in Davis v. School District of the City of Pontiac, 309 F.Supp. 734, 742 (E.D. Mich. 1970), aff'd, _____ F.2d _____, No. 20,477 (6th Cir., May 28, 1971).

> Where a Board of Education has contributed and played a major role in the development and growth of

[2]See, e.g., Hernandez v. Texas, 347 U.S. 475 (1954); Cisneros v. Corpus Christi Ind. School Dist., _____F.Supp. _____, No. 68-C-95 (S.D. Tex. June 4, 1970), noted, 49 TEX. L.REV. 337 (1971); Clifton Puente, 218 S.W.2d 272 (Tex. Civ.App. San Antonio 1948, writ ref'd n.r.e.).

[3]Order of this Court, September 4, 1970.

> a segregated situation, the Board is guilty of *de jure* segregation.

While alleging such de jure segregation, against Mexican Americans, the Plaintiff failed in maintaining its burden of proof.

Texas has never required by law that Mexican American children be segregated, and the AISD, unlike some other school systems,[4] has never enacted regulations to this effect. Since no discriminatory rule or regulation has existed, Plaintiff has sought to demonstrate a history of discriminatory practices against Mexican Americans. All that Plaintiff has succeeded in showing is that at one time the AISD had overlapping school zones for Pease and the West Avenue schools, and for Metz and Zavala. During this period, prior to World War II, the West Avenue and Zavala schools were referred to as "Mexican" schools, since their enrollment was totally Mexican American, and since their programs were designed to meet the needs of a largely migrant population with a fluctuating attendance pattern. Even during this period, there were a number of Mexican Americans attending the so-called "Anglo" schools.[5] A pattern of *de jure* segregation is not established by the statement of a former student that Mexican Americans were encouraged to attend Zavala rather

[4]See, e.g., Gonzales v. Sheely, 96 F.Supp. 1004 (D. Ariz. 1951); Mendez v. Westminister School Dist., 64 F.Supp. 544 (S.D. Cal. 1946), aff'd, 161 F.2d 774 (9th Cir. 1947); Ind. School Dist. v. Salvatierra, 33 S.W.2d 790 (Tex.Civ.App. San Antonio 1930, no writ), appeal dismissed w.o.j. & cert. denied, 284 U.S. 580 (1931).

[5]Defendant's Exhibit 69, as explained by the testimony of Arthur Cunningham, Pupil Placement Officer for AISD.

than Metz in 1936-41,[6] the testimony of an educational expert that concentration of Mexican Americans in certain schools is detrimental,[7] the opinion of an interested, but non-expert citizen that segregation continues,[8] and the implication of a recent student that the education in one minority school is inferior.[9] The only other evidence on the issue of Mexican American segregation consists of testimony by certain AISD administrators and former school board members.[10] Taken as a whole, the testimony of the witnesses, particularly that of Dr. Wilburn, Mr. Cunningham, and Dr. Davidson, conclusively shows that at no time during the existence of the AISD has there been *de jure* segregation against Mexican Americans,[11] and this

[6]Testimony of Richard Moya, Travis County Precinct 4 Commissioner.

[7]Testimony of Dr. George Sanchez.

[8]Testimony of Dr. Jorge Lara-Braud.

[9]Testimony of Mr. Alfred Munoz.

[10]Testimony of Mr. Willie Kocurek, Mr. Graham, Mr. C. N. Avery, Mr. Noble Prentice, and Mr. Will Davis.

[11]Because of this finding, which is limited to the factual setting existing in the AISD, the Court is under no constitutional obligation to integrate Mexican Americans throughout the school system. This is not to say that the mere integration of Mexican Americans with Blacks is legally sufficient to meet the command of Brown I, Brown II, and Swann. Such a plan, by placing the burden of integration upon another ethnic minority rather than upon the entire community, would clearly be inconsistent with the equitable principles which these decisions make obligatory on this Court. Moreover, Dr. Davidson specifically indicated that an earlier HEW plan to mix Blacks and Mexican Americans was not a sound educational proposal. Surely such a plan would accomplish none of the objectives announced in Brown and subsequent decisions.

Court so finds.[12]

A different situation exists as regards Black students. It is undisputed that at one time the AISD maintained a dual school system with educational opportunities separate and inherently unequal for Blacks. However, unlike many communities elsewhere in the South, the City of Austin has since *Brown II* adopted a progressive and non-discriminatory policy in the administration of its public schools. The government has made no showing that in the period from 1955 to the present the AISD has intentionally perpetuated segregation of Blacks; the record instead indicates that during this period the school administration's

[12]Specifically, the Court makes the following findings of fact, based on the record as a whole:

(a) The Austin Independent School District has never adopted, published or promulgated any written or unwritten rules, regulations or policies having as their purpose the discrimination against, or segregation or isolation of, Mexican Americans.

(b) The Austin Independent School District has never discriminated against, or attempted to discriminate against, isolate or segregate Mexican Americans in any form whatsoever, particularly in:

(1) site location of schools;
(2) school construction;
(3) drawing of school attendance zones;
(4) student assignments;
(5) faculty assignments;
(6) staff assignments;
(7) faculty and staff employment;
(8) extracurricular activities; and
(9) transportation.

(c) The Zavala and West Elementary Schools were not built for the purpose of discriminating against, isolating or segregating students on the basis of Mexican American ethnic origin.

official acts have not been motivated by any discriminatory purpose.[13] The Court therefore deals in this case only with vestiges of state-imposed segregation, in the form of some all-white and all black schools, that survived under a racially-neutral policy on the part of the local authorities. In this connection, it should be observed that those one-race schools that do exist in the system take much of their present character from historical residential patterns that developed from economic factors and from "the myriad factors of human existence which can cause discrimination in a multitude of ways on racial, religious or ethnic grounds."[14] That is to say, the racial composition of these schools, whether white, black or Mexican American, closely tracks the demography of the neighborhoods in which they are located, and while the racial segregation of Blacks formerly imposed by statute in Texas may at one time have influenced the development of these patterns, no persuasive evidence has been introduced that the local school authorities have purposefully sought to perpetuate them following repeal of the statute.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ., supra, 28 L.Ed. 2d at 568, relying upon Green v. County School Bd., 391 U.S. 430, 435 (1968), announced that in addition to pupil placement,

> existing policy and practice with regard to faculty, staff, transportation, extracurricular activities, and facilities were among the most important indicia of a segregated system.

---

[13]See especially testimony of Mr. Cunningham.

[14]Swann v. Charlotte Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ., supra, 28 L.Ed.2d at 570.

Reviewing these criteria, this Court finds that the AISD has adequately desegregated faculty and staff,[15] transportation, [16] extracurricular activities,[17] and facilities.

As regards the last criterion, Plaintiff argues that the AISD has purposefully located school facilities so as to perpetuate segregation of minorities. However, the evidence adduced at trial, especially the testimony of Mr. Cunningham, shows that the AISD has followed a policy of "racial neutrality" in locating facilities. The AISD considers neighborhood need, not race, in choosing school sites.

Thus far, the Court has held that no *de jure* discrimination on the basis of race or ethnic origin has ever been practiced against Mexican-Americans in the operation of the AISD, but that vestiges of a dual system continue to exist with respect to Blacks. In light of this ruling on the Mexican-American issue, the Court is of the opinion that the parties should be given an opportunity to conduct further negotiations aimed at agreement on a common plan for the desegregation of Austin schools. It is evident that in drawing the plans heretofore submitted the parties contemplated that the Court might rule otherwise on this issue; therefore even if a common plan cannot be agreed upon the parties should be allowed to make such revisions to their individual proposals as they may deem necessary or desirable. This will ensure full and fair consideration of all the alternative remedies available for resolving the complex and difficult problems presented.

The Court offers the parties the following guidelines as they review their plans:

---

[15]See especially Defendant's Exhibit 79.

[16]See especially Defendant's Exhibit 24.

[17]See especially Defendant's Exhibit 81.

(1) The parties should explore every possible avenue for arriving at a common plan. This directive simply renews and emphasizes the plain import of the Court's earlier Order of September 4, 1970, and the four separate extensions thereof, which were given the parties so that such negotiation could take place. The evidence adduced at trial revealed little, if any, effort by the parties to cooperate in compliance with these orders, and now that the parties have presented their separate plans the desirability of cooperation appears all the more obvious. A comparison of the projected enrollment figures for high schools and junior high schools from Plaintiff's Exhibits 22 and 24 with Defendant's Exhibit 37 reveals that the parties are very close to agreement, at least as to these portions of their proposals. Consequently, the Court directs the parties to develop a common proposal to resolve part of the desegregation problem, even if they cannot agree on a plan for the elementary schools. It will be far more desirable for all concerned to have the parties combine the best elements of their separate plans than to have the Court draw its own plan.

(2) By far the most pressing issue in this case is the extent to which transportation of students by bus should be utilized in achieving a unitary system. "The importance of bus transportation as a normal and accepted tool of educational policy" has been recognized by the Supreme Court[18] and by both parties to this suit in the plans they have submitted. Furthermore, it is now clear that "bus transportation as one tool of school desegregation" falls

[18]Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, supra, at 574.

within the Court's power to provide equitable relief.[19] However, the evidence adduced at trial persuades this Court that there are severe practical limitation on the degree of busing that should be ordered in aid of desegregation. Therefore, the Court encourages the parties to combine the best elements of both their plans with a view toward minimizing busing.

(3) The testimony at trial makes clear the impossibility of the continued use of the Anderson facility as either a junior or senior high school. The size of the facility and its location away from major traffic arteries, as well as the difficulty of drawing a realistic attendance zone that will include Anglos make it impossible to integrate this school. Therefore, the parties should avoid plans which include Anderson as a junior or senior high school.

(4) Finally, the import of this Court's decision on the Mexican-American question should be clarified. Although the Court has determined that *de jure* segregation of Mexican-Americans does not exist, the Court will nevertheless consider the effect upon this ethnic minority of any plan submitted by the parties. The entire community, not just one segment of it, must bear the burden of integration. Furthermore, as both Dr. Davidson and Dr. Sanchez appropriately testified, there will be little educational value in a plan which merely integrates one socially and economically disadvantaged ethnic group, the Blacks, with another, the Mexican-Americans.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the officials of the Austin Independent

[19]*Id.* at 574-75.

School District shall immediately enter cooperative consultation respecting the proposals heretofore submitted to the Court, with the aim of agreeing upon a common desegregation plan consistent with the guidelines contained in the foregoing Memorandum Opinion.

Should the Office of Education and the school district agree upon a common desegregation plan, they shall so report to this Court by filing said plan immediately, but not later than July 16, 1971. Should the parties fail to agree in whole or in part upon a common plan, the Office of Education and the school district are both directed to file any revisions they may wish to make to all or any portion of the existing plans immediately, but not later than July 16, 1971.

SO ORDERED this the 28th day of June, 1971, at Austin, Texas.

JACK ROBERTS
UNITED STATES
DISTRICT JUDGE

AMENDMENT XIV.—CITIZENSHIP; PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES; DUE PROCESS; EQUAL PROTECTION; APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATION; DISQUALIFICATION OF OFFICERS; PUBLIC DEBT; ENFORCEMENT

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives for Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

42 U.S.C. §2000c-6. Civil actions by the Attorney General—Complaint; certification; notice to school board or college authority; institution of civil action; relief requested; jurisdiction; transportation of pupils to achieve racial balance; judicial power to insure compliance with constitutional standards; impleading additional parties as defendants

(a) Whenever the Attorney General receives a complaint in writing—

(1) signed by a parent or group of parents to the effect that his or their minor children, as members of a class of persons similarly situated, are being deprived by a school board of the equal protection of the laws, or

(2) signed by an individual, or his parent, to the effect that he has been denied admission to or not permitted to continue in attendance at a public college by reason of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, and the Attorney General believes the complaint is meritorious and certifies that the signer or signers of such complaint are unable, in his judgment, to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings for relief and that the institution of an action will materially further the orderly achievement of desegregation in public education, the Attorney General is authorized, after giving notice of such complaint to the appropriate school board or college authority and after certifying that he is satisfied that such board or authority has had a reasonable time to adjust the conditions alleged in such complaint, to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action in any appropriate district court of the United States against such parties and for such relief as may be appropriate, and such court shall have and shall exercise jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section, provided that nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance, or otherwise

enlarge the existing power of the court to insure compliance with constitutional standards. The Attorney General may implead as defendants such additional parties as are or become necessary to the grant of effective relief hereunder.

Persons unable to initiate and maintain legal proceedings

(b) The Attorney General may deem a person or persons unable to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section when such person or persons are unable, either directly or through other interested persons or organizations, to bear the expense of the litigation or to obtain effective legal representation; or whenever he is satisfied that the institution of such litigation would jeopardize the personal safety, employment, or economic standing of such person or persons, their families, or their property.

"Parent" and "complaint" defined

(c) The term "parent" as used in this section includes any person standing in loco parentis. A "complaint" as used in this section is a writing or document within the meaning of section 1001, Title 18.

Pub.L. 88-352, Title IV, §407, July 2, 1964, 78 Stat. 248; Pub.L. 92-318, Title IX, §906(a), June 23, 1972, 86 Stat. 375.

SUBCHAPTER I—EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES
PART 1—POLICY AND PURPOSE

20 U.S.C. § 1701. Congressional declaration of policy

(a) The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States that—

(1) all children enrolled in public schools are entitled to equal educational opportunity without regard to race, color, sex, or national orgin; and

(2) the neighborhood is the appropriate basis for determining public school asignments.

(b) In order to carry out this policy, it is the purpose of this subchapter to specify appropriate remedies for the orderly removal of the vestiges of the dual school system.

Pub.L. 93-380, Title II, § 202, Aug. 21, 1974, 88 Stat. 514.

20 U.S.C. §1702. Congressional findings; necessity for Congress to specify appropriate remedies for elimination of dual school systems without affecting judicial enforcement of fifth and fourteenth amendments

(a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the maintenance of dual school systems in which students are assigned to schools solely on the basis of race, color, sex, or national origin denies to those students the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment;

(2) for the purpose of abolishing dual school systems and eliminating the vestiges thereof, many

local educational agencies have been required to reorganize their school systems, to reassign students, and to engage in the extensive transportation of students;

(3) the implementation of desegregation plans that require extensive student transportation has, in many cases, required local educational agencies to expend large amount of funds, thereby depleting their financial resources available for the maintenance or improvement of the quality of educational facilities and instruction provided;

(4) transportation of students which creates serious risks to their health and safety, disrupts the educational process carried out with respect to such students, and impinges significantly on their educational opportunity, is excessive;

(5) the risks and harms created by excessive transportation are particularly great for children enrolled in the first six grades; and

(6) the guidelines provided by the courts for fashioning remedies to dismantle dual school systems have been, as the Supreme Court of the United States has said, "incomplete and imperfect," and have not established, a clear, rational, and uniform standard for determining the extent to which a local educational agency is required to reassign and transport its students in order to eliminate the vestiges of a dual school system.

(b) For the foregoing reasons, it is necessary and proper that the Congress, pursuant to the powers granted to it by the Constitution of the United States, specify appropriate remedies for the elimination of the

vestiges of dual school systems, except that the provisions of this chapter are not intended to modify or diminish the authority of the courts of the United States to enforce fully the fifth and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

Pub.L. 93-380, Title II, § 203, Aug. 21, 1974, 88 Stat. 514.

20 U.S.C. § 1704. Balance not required

The failure of an educational agency to attain a balance, on the basis of race, color, sex, or national origin, of students among its schools shall not constitute a denial of equal educational opportunity, or equal protection of the laws.

Pub.L. 93-380, Title II, § 205, Aug. 21, 1974, 88 Stat. 515.

20 U.S.C. § 1705. Assignment on neighborhood basis not a denial of equal educational opportunity

Subject to the other provisions of this subchapter, the assignment by an educational agency of a student to the school nearest his place of residence which provides the appropriate grade level and type of education for such student is not a denial of equal educational opportunity or of equal protection of the laws unless such assignment is for the purpose of segregating students on the basis of race, color, sex, or national origin, or the public school to which such student is assigned was located on its site for the purpose of segregating students on such basis.

Pub.L. 93-380, Title II, § 206, Aug. 21, 1974, 88 Stat. 515.

20 U.S.C. § 1707. Population changes without effect, per se, on school population changes

When a court of competent jurisdiction determines that a school system is desegregated, or that it meets the constitutional requirements, or that it is a unitary system, or that it has no vestiges of a dual system, and thereafter residential shifts in population occur which result in school population changes in any school within such a desegregated school system, such school population changes so occurring shall not, per se, constitute a cause for civil action for a new plan of desegregation or for modification of the court approved plan.

Pub.L. 93-380, Title II, § 208, Aug. 21, 1974, 88 Stat. 516.